

**REGULAR WEEKLY SESSION-----ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL**

**April 15, 2002**

**12:00 p.m.**

**The Council of the City of Roanoke met in regular session on Monday, April 15, 2002 at 12:00 p.m., in the Roanoke Civic Center Exhibition Hall, City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, pursuant to Chapter 2, Administration, Article II, City Council, Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Rule 1, Regular Meetings, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Resolution No. 35798-040101 adopted by the Council on April 1, 2002.**

**PRESENT: Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----5.**

**ABSENT: Council Members William White, Sr., and C. Nelson Harris-----2.**

**OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.**

**The meeting was opened with a prayer by Sherman P. Lea, Chair, Roanoke City School Board.**

**The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Ralph K. Smith.**

**YOUTH: The Members of Council participated in a luncheon recognizing all participants in the year 2002 Student Government Day activities.**

**Students from the Roanoke City Public Schools and Roanoke Catholic High School spent the day with City Council Members and City staff to learn more about the operation of City government.**

**At 1:20 p.m. the meeting of Roanoke City Council was declared in recess to be reconvened at 2:00 p.m., in the Roanoke City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., Roanoke, Virginia.**

At 2:00 p.m., on Monday, April 15, 2002, the regular meeting of City Council reconvened in the Roanoke City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with the following Council Members in attendance, Mayor Smith presiding.

**PRESENT:** Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., C. Nelson Harris, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith -----6.

**ABSENT:** Council Member William White, Sr.-----1.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by Claudia A. Whitworth, Secretary of the Local Spiritual Assembly of Baha í of Roanoke.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

**PRESENTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:**

**PROCLAMATIONS-YOUTH:** The Mayor presented a proclamation declaring Monday, April 15, 2002, as Student Government Day 2002.

**PROCLAMATIONS-COMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENT:** The Mayor presented a proclamation declaring the week of April 14 - 20, 2002, as National Telecommunicator's Week.

Ms. Wyatt offered the following resolution:

(#35799-041502) A RESOLUTION recognizing all of the City's E-911 Center personnel as Roanoke Public Safety Telecommunicators of the year 2002.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 65, page 511.)

Mr. Wyatt moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35799-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent)**

**On behalf of the Members of Council and the citizens of the City of Roanoke, the Mayor presented the Proclamation and a ceremonial copy of Resolution No. 35799-041592 to Ronald L. Wade, Communications Superintendent. He commended and recognized the staff of the City's E-911 Center who have demonstrated their ability to perform by providing outstanding emergency responses to citizens of Roanoke even while short staffed and responding to a flood of calls which were triggered by the September 11, 2001 tragedy at the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia.**

**PROCLAMATIONS-HOUSING/AUTHORITY: The Mayor presented a proclamation declaring the month of April 2002 as Fair Housing Month.**

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**The Mayor advised that all matters listed under the Consent Agenda were considered to be routine by the Members of Council and would be enacted by one motion in the form, or forms, listed on the Consent Agenda, and if discussion was desired, that item would be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately. He call specific attention to two requests for Closed Session.**

**MINUTES: Minutes of the regular meeting of Council held on Monday, March 18, 2002, were before the body.**

**Mr. Carder moved that the reading of the Minutes be dispensed with and that the Minutes be approved as recorded. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote.**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**COMMITTEES-CITY COUNCIL: A communication from the Mayor requesting a Closed Meeting to discuss vacancies on various authorities boards, commissions and committees appointed by Council, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.**

Mr. Carder moved that Council concur in the request of the Mayor to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss vacancies on various authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by Council, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote.

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**POLICE DEPARTMENT-OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-TOWING CONTRACT:** A report of qualification of William F. Clark as a member of the Towing Advisory Board, for a term ending June 30, 2004, was before Council.

Mr. Carder moved that the report of qualification be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

#### REGULAR AGENDA

**PUBLIC HEARINGS: NONE.**

**PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

**BUDGET-ROANOKE VALLEY RESOURCE AUTHORITY:** A communication from John R. Hubbard, Chief Executive Officer, Roanoke Valley Resource Authority, advising that in accordance with the Member Use Agreement, the Resource Authority is submitting its proposed 2002-2003 Annual Budget, in the amount of \$8,269,925.00, to Council for approval, was before the body.

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following resolution:**

**(#35801-041502) A RESOLUTION approving the annual budget of the Roanoke Valley Resource Authority for Fiscal Year 2002-2003, upon certain terms and conditions.**

**(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 65, page 514.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35801-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**REPORTS OF OFFICERS:**

**CITY MANAGER:**

**BRIEFINGS:**

**CITY EMPLOYEES- PARKS AND RECREATION:** The City Manager introduced Steven Buschor, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation, who assumed his position on April 2, 2002.

**BUDGET-HOUSING/AUTHORITY:**The City Manager introduced a briefing with regard to the proposed fiscal year 2003 budget, which will be presented by Barry L. Key, Director, Management and Budget. She advised that fiscal year 2003 has been a challenging budget which was balanced on several occasions with information that was received from the State regarding budget reductions at that level; however, the budget continues to change. She stated that it is anticipated that more surprises may be in store throughout the balance of this fiscal year and into the next fiscal year. She called attention to outstanding cooperation from the various City departments, agencies and organizations; and advised that today begins the public process of the City Manager's recommended budget, with a public hearing to be held on Monday, April 29, 2002 at 7:00 p.m., in the Roanoke Civic Center Exhibit Hall, budget work sessions are scheduled for May 9 and 10, and adoption of the 2003 fiscal year budget is scheduled for Monday, May 13, 2002, at 2:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber.

**Mr. Key advised that the recommended budget for fiscal year 2003 was far from a typical budget in the sense that if the City's local revenues were expected to grow at a typical rate of 4.1 per cent, and if revenues received by the City from the State were expected to grow at a typical rate of 5.5 per cent, the City would have \$4.9 million in additional revenue to allocate for community needs. However, he stated that General Fund revenues for fiscal year 2003 are expected to grow only \$3.6 million to a total of \$194.9 million, or an increase of 1.9 per cent. He noted that in the 25 years that he has worked with the City's budget, only one other fiscal year experienced a smaller percentage growth rate - the fiscal year 1992 budget which increased only 0.04 per cent during the last major economic recession; and local revenues for fiscal year 2003 are expected to increase \$3.5 million, or only 2.4 per cent.**

**He presented the following budget highlights:**

**The real estate tax is the City's single largest source of local revenue and is predicted to grow \$2.5 million, or 5.3 per cent. 2.1 per cent of the total 5.3 per cent in growth comes from new construction activity, indicating a continuing positive trend in this area, while 3.2 per cent of the total 5.3 per cent expected growth comes from increased property values.**

**Personal property tax is the City's second largest source of local revenue and the rate of growth is expected to decrease 1.8 per cent due to an anticipated slow down in new vehicle sales.**

**Sales tax, the City's largest local tax source, is expected to increase minimally by 0.5 per cent due to the slowed economy and growing regional competition for the sales tax dollar.**

**Utility tax is the City's fourth largest local tax source, and is expected to grow 5.4 per cent due to continued growth and expansion in the telecommunications industry and implementation of the water and sewer rate restructuring plan this past fiscal year.**

**All other local revenue sources should increase only 1.6 per cent.**

**The revenue estimate for State aid is based on the budget approved by the General Assembly and does not anticipate any changes that may be forthcoming from the final session of the General Assembly this week or from the Governor's proposed budget amendments.**

The Governor recently proposed one unanticipated initiative that may affect the expenditure side of the budget - a \$5.00 landfill tipping fee increase to generate new funds for open space preservation, water quality improvement, and other environmental initiatives, will result in a \$258,000.00 annual increase in Roanoke's landfill tipping fee expenditures. It is unclear how much of this new funding may be returned to localities in the form of grants as part of the Governor's program; therefore, additional revenue or expenditure adjustments may be necessary during the coming months as the full impact of State budget reductions becomes more evident.

State aid reductions fall into the following categories:

Alcoholic Beverage Control Tax	(\$ 103,716.00)
Constitutional Officers	( 286,506.00)
Law Enforcement - HB 599 Funds	( 331,256.00)
VJCCCA Programs	( 571,496.00)
TOTAL	(1,292,974.00)

While State aid in these categories will decrease almost \$1.3 million, State aid received by the City in support of its street maintenance activities will increase \$284,000.00 for a net reduction of approximately \$1.0 million, or 2.2 per cent.

The City will also lose \$46,705.00 annually in State grant funding for the Office on Youth.

The budget proposes a number of revenue initiatives in the following categories which will offset the City's expected State aid reduction by generating \$1.1 million in new local revenue; and the City Treasurer and the Manager of Billings and Collections, two departments that are directly responsible for collecting City revenues, have recommended several of these initiatives.

- Elimination of Tax Discounts
- New Fees Authorized by State
- Fee Increases
- Enhanced Collection Strategies
- Increased Admissions Tax Rate

Revenue initiatives proposed in the 2003 budget include:

Elimination of the seller's discount for collection of the Cigarette Tax and Prepared Food and Beverage Tax;

Addition of new fees authorized by the 2002 General Assembly,

**including a Courthouse Security Fee, Jail Inmate Processing Fee, and DNA Sample Fee for Jail Inmates;**

**Adoption of fees authorized by the Code of Virginia to recover debt collection costs;**

**Encourage more timely payment of delinquent taxes and fees;**

**Increase in current fees for various departmental services, including Fire-EMS and Planning and Building Services, to recover the costs of providing services.**

**Increase in Commercial and Central Business District solid waste collection fees to recover the supplemental cost of providing more than one free collection per week, as provided with residential collection service.**

**Change in the interest accrual date for delinquent real estate tax payments to the first of the following month to be consistent with personal property tax.**

**Increase in the fine for late payment of parking tickets from \$10.00 to \$15.00.**

**Increase in the Admissions Tax rate to 6.5 per cent City-wide to partially fund Phase II of improvements to the Civic Center. The administration recommends that Council seek the General Assembly's approval in 2003 to levy a higher admissions tax rate for ticket sales at Roanoke's civic facilities only. The City-wide rate of 6.5 per cent could then be rescinded if this effort is successful.**

**With regard to the expenditure side of the General Fund budget, a number of high quality budgetary commitments have been funded with the \$3.6 million dollars of revenue:**

**Roanoke's School system will receive almost \$1.4 million in additional local funding as its share of local tax revenues per the existing revenue sharing formula, allowing the School Board adequate funding to increase the level of teacher raises to 3.25 per cent. The total school budget will increase \$1.9 million, or 1.9 per cent.**

**\$2.4 million in funding is recommended to keep City employees' compensation and benefits competitive - a 3.0 per cent of base pay merit increase is recommended and additional funding is provided to help offset anticipated increases in the cost of employee health care and dental insurance.**

**A 2.6 per cent cost of living adjustment for retirees is proposed, consistent with the recent increase in Social Security benefits and adjustments being made by other local government retirement systems.**

**\$1.5 million in additional funding for capital and debt service requirements is recommended to:**

**Continue providing additional debt service funding as part of the six-year plan approved by Council to budget an additional \$570,000.00 each fiscal year to build future debt capacity for bonds to support the Capital Improvement Program;**

**Purchase \$1.2 million in vehicular equipment through a capital lease recently approved by Council. Due to a one-time reduction in State funding requirements, the City will be able to purchase new leaf collection and pothole-patching equipment to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of these important services, and acquire new technologies for improving the efficiency of administrative operation; and**

**Provide cash funding for:**

**Site acquisition and design expenses for the first of three replacement stations planned in the Fire-EMS Facility Improvement Program;**

**Startup costs for Phase II of improvements to the Civic Center; and**

**Stormwater management efforts to comply with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System - Phase II requirements.**

**\$565,000.00 is budgeted for non-discretionary expenditure increases in insurance premiums, electricity and street lighting. This total also funds the employee parking shuttle due to expiration of the startup grant received in fiscal year 2001, and parking spaces in the Gainsboro Parking Garage due to a contractual obligation.**

**Also included in the \$565,000.00 total is funding for a recommended two per cent increase in the budgeted amounts for Blue Ridge Behavioral Healthcare, Total Action Against Poverty and Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, and for Cultural Services and Human Services Committees as well.**

**Additional funding has been provided for solid waste management collection activities now that the service transition process is complete. Collection costs are not anticipated to be as high as the current fiscal year because of the acquisition of new collection equipment and reduced reliance on contract labor, even though the volume of waste collected has grown significantly.**

**\$485,000.00 is budgeted for the following service initiatives that should directly benefit Roanoke citizens:**

**The State has eliminated all funding for the Office on Youth program state-wide and several steps are being taken in this budget to partially offset this loss of State dollars. For fiscal year 2003, the Office on Youth will become a part of the Department of Parks and Recreation to allow sharing of administrative resources in an environment that has the shared mission of working with youth. Additionally \$150,000.00 in additional funding is recommended for an expanded slate of youth programs currently under development by the newly hired Director of Parks and Recreation.**

**A change in the manner in which special events are managed is also recommended, along with startup funding to help insure a successful transition process for this important piece of the City's overall tourism development strategy. The new special events strategy seeks to develop an improved package of special events and an improved process for managing and coordinating special events by more fully utilizing the Roanoke Special Events Committee as a "gatekeeping", or coordinating body.**

**One of Council's short-term action items is anti-litter education and enforcement. To help address the overall problem of litter, an expanded litter cleanup initiative is proposed in the budget, including neighborhood cleanup days on select Saturdays, support by City staff and equipment, and a 50 per cent increase in funding and effort to pick up litter along streets and rights-of-way.**

**The budget recommends \$25,000.00 in financial support for the Roanoke Adolescent Health Partnership - funds that likely will be used to hire a much needed part-time program developer or fund raiser to ensure the organization's long-term sustainability. These funds will be appropriated to the Roanoke Public Schools budget to allocate to this important community program.**

**Six staff positions are recommended to help develop new revenue streams in support of expanded recreational and human service programs, effectively manage human service programs, and bring in-house previously contracted services for the Law Library and Comprehensive Services Act programs to improve cost-effectiveness.**

**In order to balance the fiscal year 2003 budget, \$2.7 million in budget reductions were made, as follows:**

**The elimination of 24 positions and unfunding of an additional 11 positions in 18 separate departments or divisions of City government;**

**Adjustments to Recovered Costs accounts to more accurately anticipate revenues to be received in support of program costs;**

**Adjustments to Internal Service accounts based on five per cent reductions in Internal Fund departmental budgets; and**

**The anticipation of cost savings to be realized with the replacement of the City's telephone system, estimated to be \$200,000.00 annually, an example of how recent investments in new technology are beginning to produce dividends.**

**The Housing and Urban Development, or HUD, budget has been prepared consistent with the new funding policy recently adopted by Council. 85 per cent of the \$4.5 million budget is proposed to be spent on 17 community development programs or projects, evenly split between housing and other neighborhood, community and economic development activities.**

**15 per cent of the budget would be spent on 16 human and homeless services programs.**

**The following three new projects are being recommended for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program:**

**Phase II of improvements to the Civic Center requiring a future bond issue of \$14.3 million, to be partially funded from the recommended 1.5 per cent increase in the Admissions Tax;**

**The initial phase of the Fire-EMS Facility Improvement project funded from existing cash funding and additional revenue from increases in EMS fees.**

**Improvements to the Water Pollution Control Plant to improve wet weather capacity - Roanoke's share of the estimated \$35 million cost would be approximately \$17.5 million. A sewer rate increase would be required in fiscal year 2004.**

**In closing, Mr. Key advised that the fiscal year 2003 budget has been a challenge to prepare; the City administration has strived to avoid reductions in service levels, continue to fairly compensate City employees, and move the community forward with critical capital improvements within the limited resources available.**

**The City Manager presented additional information on revenue initiatives containing charts and comparisons with other localities.**

**Mr. Harris noted a concern with regard to the proposed cuts in the area of public safety which he would further address with the City Manager and as a part of budget study deliberations. He advised that his concern is also reflective of community concern relative to budget cuts in public safety.**

**Ms. Wyatt reiterated the remarks of Council Member Harris and asked that the record reflect her concern. She added that many City employees have stated that they would prefer to retain the positions which are proposed to be cut and take a smaller increase in pay, because City employees value their positions and the ability to adequately perform their jobs.**

**Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the budget briefing would be received and filed.**

#### **ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR ACTION:**

**CITY INFORMATION SYSTEMS-RISK MANAGEMENT FUND: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the need for the procurement of a new Risk Management Information System was identified by the City's Department of Technology; after proper advertisement, three bids were received and evaluated; all bids received were for systems which cost much more than available funding; and all systems included components and modules which were in addition to those required to fulfill the City's needs, thus, bids that were received should be rejected.**

**It was further advised that although the sealed bid method of procurement would normally be used, it is not practicable or fiscally advantageous to the public in this particular case; the Code of the City of Roanoke provides, as an alternate method of procurement to using the bid process, a process identified as competitive negotiation; prior approval by Council is necessary before the alternate method may be used, which method will allow for competitive negotiations with two or more providers to determine the best qualified at the most competitive price; and the experience, qualifications and references of firms that can provide the system are of equal, if not greater, importance as the cost.**

**The City Manager recommended that Council reject all bids and authorize the use of competitive negotiation to secure vendors to provide the City's new Risk Management Information System.**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following resolution:**

**(#35802-041502) A RESOLUTION rejecting all proposals for the purchase of a new Risk Management Information System for the City of Roanoke and designating the procurement method known as competitive negotiation, rather than the procurement method known as competitive sealed bidding, to be used in procuring the Risk Management Information System.**

**(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 65, page 514.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35802-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder.**

**Ms. Wyatt called attention to the need for a written policy when purchasing technology systems for the City to ensure compatibility of the systems. She spoke to the importance of implementing a technology master plan which will govern all technology purchases.**

**Mr. Bestpitch concurred in the remarks of Ms. Wyatt and inquired if a competitive negotiation process will ensure that the concern of Ms. Wyatt is addressed.**

**The City Manager spoke to the advantage of negotiating the precise elements needed by the City, as opposed to modifying an existing program. She advised that during the past year a committee of appointed, elected and City department Managers have served on a master committee for technology, the purpose of which is to guide the purchase of future systems to ensure integration of systems and support by central technology staff; and the City organization, as a whole, will prioritize which departments should be addressed initially in order to build a foundation for additional systems. If Council desires, she advised that the Technology Committee could present a briefing on accomplishments to date.**

**The Mayor inquired about the number of bids that were rejected for the risk management program and the dollar amounts; whereupon, the City Manger advised that all bids exceeded the City's appropriation. She stated that three bids were rejected; however, the three bidders would be sent the same information if staff is permitted to proceed through a competitive bidding process, and stressed that simply because the bids are proposed to be rejected through this form of procurement does not rule out the three bidders if the City goes through competitive negotiations.**

**The Mayor noted that the program should not have to be reinvented because other cities have police, fire, real estate, and various taxing agencies and should have technology currently in place that could be used or modified by comparable localities.**

**The City Manager advised that the matter is more involved than the specific item before Council which deals with a particular software for the risk management system. She stated that having worked in local government for many years and having reviewed other systems, it is not as easy as lifting one system from one community and transplanting that system into another community. She advised that the City organization has, in the last 18 months, tried to approach the issue in an integrated fashion and there are some basic platforms that are necessary before the City can move completely in that direction.**

**The Mayor advised that it has been recently stated that some departments in the City are not interfacing their computer systems in order to achieve maximum efficiencies, and inquired if there is a major software that applies to specific City applications.**

**The City Manager responded that she was unaware of a specific program. The Director of Finance reviewed the types of programs that are used in the Finance Department and advised that it is a matter of identifying a company that offers a broad range of modules with a system that accommodates the transaction of business by specific City departments. In general, he stated that appropriate software is available.**

**The City Manager called attention to certain professional services as identified in the City Code that may be served through competitive negotiation rather than standard procurement, and spoke in support of adding this type of procurement to the competitive negotiation list which will provide an opportunity to acquire quality programs that are needed by the City.**

**It was the consensus of Council to table the matter pending further information by the City Manager with regard to the number of bidders and dollar amounts in connection with the risk management information system.**

Later during the meeting, the City Manager advised that \$30,000.00 was allocated for the risk management information system, the low bid was \$66,975.00 and the high bid was \$79,000.00.

The Mayor requested information with regard to the type of systems used by other localities; whereupon, the City Manager advised that she would report to Council within 30 days.

Resolution No. 35802-041502 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**SEWERS AND STORM DRAINS-SIDEWALK/CURB AND GUTTER-BUDGET:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that H. & S. Construction Co. was awarded a contract, in the amount of \$644,350.00 on a unit price basis at the June 19, 2000 meeting of Council to provide new sidewalk and curbs on various streets to be designated within the City of Roanoke; at the May 21, 2001 meeting of Council, Change Order No. 1 was added to the contract to complete the curb and sidewalk on Cove Road from Abbott Street to Hersberger Road; within this area, there has been a long standing drainage problem at the intersection of Cove Road and Guildhall Avenue; this intersection and the adjacent home of a property owner at 1541 Guildhall Avenue have frequently flooded for many years; concurrent with the curb and sidewalk construction, a window of opportunity exists to install the necessary storm drain to solve the flooding problem; and funding is available in the Capital Projects Fund, Account No. 008-530-9734-9003, Miscellaneous Storm Drains Part 2.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute Change Order No. 3, in the amount of \$37,500.00 and 30 additional days of contract time, with H. & S. Construction Co. for construction of storm drain improvements at Guildhall Avenue and Cove Road; and that Council approve transfer of \$37,500.00 to Account No. 008-052-9608, New Concrete Sidewalks, Entrances and Curb-Phase V-A.

**Mr. Carder offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35803-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 516.)**

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35803-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency ordinance:**

**(#35804-041502) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the City Manager's issuance of Change Order No. 3 to the City's contract with H. & S. Construction Co. for the construction of storm drain improvements at Guildhall Avenue and Cove Road in relation to the New Concrete Sidewalks, Entrances and Curb-Phase V-A Project; and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 517.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35804-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**FLOOD REDUCTION/CONTROL:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that T. P. Parker & Son, Engineers & Surveyors, LTD., was awarded a contract in 1988 to provide surveying services for acquisition of right-of-way for the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Roanoke River Flood Reduction Project; over the course of the contract, design changes by the Corp of Engineers, modifications requested by property owners, additional subdivision and subordination plats, field stakeouts for utility relocations, and other items, have required significant additional surveying services; and previous Change Orders 1 through 7 have been approved increasing the current contract amount to \$454,452.41.

It was further advised that Change Order No. 8 will provide all surveying and mapping services needed to complete the first phase of the project, including setting additional monuments along the project right-of-way, preparation of subordination plats, boundary survey plats, revisions to plats previously prepared, title report reconciliation, revisions to base map and key map, preparation of legal descriptions and coordination and review of Corp of Engineers construction plans to confirm acquisition lines and that monumentation conforms to land acquisition plats; and funding is available in Capital Projects Fund Account No. 008-056-9620, Roanoke River Flood Reduction.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute Change Order No. 8, in the amount of \$33,990.00, and an extension of contract time through December 31, 2002, with T. P. Parker & Son, Engineers & Surveyors, LTD., for surveying and mapping services on the Roanoke River Flood Reduction Project.

Mr. Carder offered the following ordinance:

(#35805-041502) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the City Manager to execute Change Order No. 8 to the City's contract with T. P. Parker & Son, Engineers & Surveyors, LTD., for surveying and mapping services in connection with the Roanoke River Flood Reduction Project; authorizing an extension of the contract through December 31, 2002; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 518.)

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35805-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, and Wyatt -----5.

**NAYS:** None-----0.

(Mayor Smith abstained from voting inasmuch as T. P. Parker and Sons, Engineers and Surveyors, rents space from a company in which he owns interest.)

(Council Member White was absent.)

**APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY-FLOOD REDUCTION/CONTROL-AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER-EQUIPMENT:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Roanoke River Flood Reduction Project contains channel widening and a greenway trail between Jefferson Street and Walnut Street; this area is located directly across the Roanoke River from Phase 1A of the South Jefferson Redevelopment Area; in this area and located on City property, Appalachian Power Company, d/b/a American Electric Power (AEP), has an easement and an existing 69KV overhead electrical transmission line located in the path of the project; and the line also has low-hanging wires that do not allow adequate clearance for the designed greenway trail.

It was further advised that the preferred option for relocating the line is to place the line underground between South Roanoke Park and the Walnut Street Substation; since AEP requires its own design, bidding and construction administration for all lines within its system, it is a sole source for the work; AEP has agreed to a contract for the relocation, in an amount not to exceed \$2,060,384.00, to be completed by February 1, 2003; this amount also includes relocating one transmission tower in Wasena Park and completion of the work is critical to the construction schedule for the flood reduction project; no easements are needed from third parties inasmuch as the alignment crosses only City owned properties and right-of-way; and funding is available in Capital Projects Fund, Account No. 008-056-9620, Roanoke River Flood Reduction.

The City Manager recommended that Council determine that AEP is the only source practicably available to provide for relocation of the transmission line as above described; and authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Appalachian Power Company, d/b/a American Electric Power (AEP), in an amount not to exceed \$2,060,384.00 for relocation of the transmission line as required for the Roanoke River Flood Reduction Project, said work to be completed by February 1, 2003.

Mr. Carder offered the following ordinance:

**(#35800-041502) AN ORDINANCE** determining that Appalachian Power Company, d/b/a American Electric Power (AEP), is the only source practicably available to provide for the relocation of AEP's existing 69KV overhead electrical transmission line located in the area between Jefferson Street and Walnut Street across the Roanoke River from Phase 1A of the South Jefferson Redevelopment Area; authorizing and awarding a contract for such work, upon certain terms and conditions; authorizing the proper City officials to execute the requisite contract for such work; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance by title.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 512.)

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35800-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**BUDGET-CITY INFORMATION SYSTEMS-EQUIPMENT:** The City Manager submitted a communication in connection with an emergency generator, new uninterruptible power system, automatic transfer switch and re-work of the present battery back-up for the Department of Technology, advising that the battery back-up provides from 20 to 30 minutes in which to shut down the City's computer system without losing data; storage of data has grown such that it requires more than 30 minutes to shut down the computer, which could result in the loss of valuable data; and the generator will eliminate the need to shut down the computer.

It was further advised that after proper advertisement, seven bids were received, with Sheldon C. Nichols Construction Corporation submitting the low bid, in the amount of \$97,000.00, with 90 consecutive calendar days construction time; funding in the amount of \$105,000.00 is needed for the project; additional funds that exceed the contract amount will be used for miscellaneous project expenses, including advertising, printing, test services, minor variations in bid quantities, and unforeseen project expenses; and funding is available in Account No. 013-052-9811-9015, Wide Area Network Expansion.

The City Manager recommended that Council accept the bid of Sheldon C. Nichols Construction Corporation, in the amount of \$97,000.00 with 90 consecutive calendar days of contract time; that all other bids be rejected; and transfer \$105,000.00 from Account No. 013-052-9811-9015, to a new capital account entitled, "Emergency Generator for Department of Technology".

**Mr. Hudson offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35806-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Department of Technology Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 519.)**

**Mr. Hudson moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35806-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following ordinance:**

**(#35807-041502) AN ORDINANCE accepting the bid of Sheldon C. Nichols Construction Corporation for the new emergency generator for the Department of Technology, including a new uninterruptible power system, automatic transfer switch, and re-working the present battery back-up, awarding a contract therefor; upon certain terms and conditions; authorizing the proper City officials to execute the requisite contract for such work; rejecting all other bids made to the City for the work; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance by title.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 520 .)**

**Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35807-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**REFUSE COLLECTION-EQUIPMENT: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Capital Maintenance and Equipment Replacement Program (CMERP) has identified the need to replace two 11 cubic yard rear loading refuse trucks for Solid Waste Management; specifications were developed and, along with an Invitation for Bid, were sent to 26 providers; the lowest bid for two cab/chassis for the refuse truck, was submitted by Magic City Motor Corporation, which took exceptions to front mounted tow hooks, at a price of \$41,070.00 each; the exception is not substantial and can be waived as an informality; the lowest bid for two 11 cubic yard rear loading refuse bodies was submitted by Mid-State Equipment Co., Inc., which bid met all specifications, at a price of \$27,275.00 each; and funding is available from the Lease of Vehicle Account No. 017-440-9852-9015.**

The City Manager recommended that Council accept the bid of Magic City Motor Corporation for two cab/chassis, at a total cost of \$82,140.00; and the bid of Mid-State Equipment Co., Inc., for two 11 cubic yard bodies, at a total cost of \$54,550.00; and reject all other bids received by the City.

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following resolution:

(#35808-041502) A RESOLUTION accepting the bid of Magic City Motor Corporation, for the purchase of two new refuse cab/chassis and the bid of Mid - State Equipment Co., Inc. for the purchase of two new refuse rear loading bodies, upon certain terms and conditions; and rejecting all other bids made for such items.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 65, page 521.)

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35808-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: Council Member Wyatt-----1.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**BUILDINGS/BUILDING DEPARTMENT-MUNICIPAL BUILDING-LEASES:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Municipal Building Snack Bar has been operated under the direction of the Virginia Department of Visually Handicapped since 1941, at which time a request was made of Council that a food stand be placed in the Municipal Building free of charge; the request was granted, and a food stand was placed in the corridor on the first floor of the Municipal Building (now known as Municipal North), and when Municipal South was completed, the snack bar was moved into its present location without a written agreement; and current operator of the snack bar is the Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, a division of the Virginia Department of Visually Handicapped, which has requested a written agreement, pursuant to the following terms:

Number of Square Feet:	998.25 s.f. plus an 18.5 s.f. alcove outside the dining facility
Term of the Agreement:	One year, with four additional one year renewal options
Lease Rate:	No Charge
Utilities:	Provided by City
Janitorial and Maintenance:	Provided by Lessee

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute a Lease Agreement with the Commonwealth of Virginia Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, as set forth above.

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following ordinance:

(#35809-041502) AN ORDINANCE authoring the use of certain City-owned property by the Commonwealth of Virginia Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, upon certain terms and conditions; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 522.)

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35809-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**TRAFFIC-BUDGET-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-STREETS AND ALLEYS:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Advance Stores Co., Inc., headquartered in Roanoke County on Airport Road, previously announced an expansion to take place at its headquarters site; as a condition of the expansion, Advance requested a Governor's Opportunity Fund (GOF) grant of \$500,000.00 and certain infrastructure improvements, including two new traffic signals, to be installed on Airport Road; at that time, the City of Roanoke and Roanoke County entered into a "Traffic Signals Agreement", dated April 13, 2000; however, that specific expansion project did not take place and as Advance Stores expanded its business, it contemplated relocating facilities to another state; on November 28, 2001, Advance stores announced that an expansion would occur, with a significant portion of the new investment to take place in the City of Roanoke at the former Crossroads Mall site; Advance stores insists that traffic improvements are still needed on Airport Road, however, Roanoke County no longer wants to participate in the Traffic Signals Agreement since Roanoke County will not benefit from the increased investment, as originally anticipated; and a Termination Agreement is needed in order for Roanoke County to release the first \$500,000.00 of funds from the prior GOF grant.

It was further advised that as a condition of the expansion decision, the State of Virginia has awarded a new GOF grant of \$670,000.00, based on the City contributing at least that amount as a match; expansion at Crossroads Mall will allow Advance Stores to create 168 new jobs in the City of Roanoke and invest \$6.7 million in new equipment and renovations; conditions have been agreed to and are delineated in a Performance Agreement with the City's local match consisting of installation of two traffic signals on Airport Road; while the local match requirement is \$690,000.00, the City will spend more than \$1.1 million in constructing two signals; funding for the traffic signals is available in Account No. 008-052-9577; and action by Council on January 22, 2002, awarded a contract for the work and provided the necessary funds.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to enter into a Performance Agreement with Advance Stores Co., Inc., and the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Roanoke, Virginia; that she be further authorized to take such actions and to execute such documents as necessary to implement and administer the Performance Agreement; to enter into a Termination Agreement with Roanoke County canceling the City's and the County's previous obligations under the "Traffic Signals Agreement"; and that Council approve appropriation of \$670,000.00 received from the GOF grant and Roanoke County to an account to be established by the Director of Finance, establish an account receivable of the same, de-appropriate the \$175,000.00 originally expected to be paid by Roanoke County relating to the traffic signal project, and reduce account receivable by that amount.

Mr. Harris offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35810-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 523.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35810-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**Mr. Harris offered the following resolution:**

**(#35811-041502) A RESOLUTION authoring the proper City Officials to execute a Termination Agreement between the City of Roanoke, Virginia (City), and the County of Roanoke, Virginia (County), terminating a Re-Executed Agreement between the City and the County dated April 13, 2000, pertaining to their respective commitments in connection with the installation of traffic signals and related traffic improvements on Airport Road, upon certain terms and conditions.**

**(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 65, page 524.)**

**Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35811-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**Mr. Harris offered the following emergency ordinance:**

**(#35812-041502) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the proper City officials to execute a Performance Agreement among the City of Roanoke (City), the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Roanoke, Virginia (IDA), and Advance Stores Co., Inc., (Advance) that provides for certain undertakings by the parties in connection with a certain investment by Advance to take place at the former Crossroads Mall site as well as other investments and the creation of job positions at that site as well as other locations in the Roanoke Valley in return for Advance receiving grant funds from the Governor's Opportunity Fund (GOF) through the City and the IDA, all for the purpose of promoting and enhancing economic development within the City and the Roanoke Valley; and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 526.)**

**Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35812-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**ROANOKE CIVIC CENTER:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that at its meeting on May 7, 2001, Council authorized the City Manager to enter into a License Agreement between the City and Arena Ventures, LLC, to provide a certain number of National Basketball Development League (NBDL) games and a certain number of events produced by SFX Concerts, Inc., in the Civic Center Coliseum over a five-year period; the agreement mandated that the City provide locker rooms, office space and other associated improvements to the infrastructure for use of Arena Ventures during the term of the License Agreement; and at a meeting on September 4, 2001, Council authorized the City Manager to execute a Contract for Consultant Services with Rosser International, Inc., to provide design services and to prepare the required bid and construction documents for the proposed project.

It was further advised that following advertisement, five bids were received with Martin Bros. Contractors, Inc., submitting the low base bid in the amount of \$2,252,600.00; costs for two desired Additive Bid Items were also submitted; the first, Additive Bid Item No. 5, in the amount of \$67,000.00, to provide a weight training facility; and the second, Additive Bid Item No. 6, in the amount of \$30,000.00, to provide a sunscreen to shade the building's west façade, which will bring the total contract price to \$2,349,600.00, with all construction work required for the new locker and training room facilities to be substantially completed by August 15, 2002, and all work required to substantially complete the new office facilities to be completed by December 20, 2002; the five bids were evaluated by the City's consultant, Rosser International, who recommends that a contract be awarded to Martin Bros. Contractors, Inc., to include Additive Bid Item No. 5 and Additive Bid Item No. 6; funding in the total amount of \$2,738,297.00 is needed for the project, with additional funds that exceed the contract amount to be used for miscellaneous project expenses, including advertising, printing, test services, minor variations in bid quantities and unforeseen project expenses.

The City Manager recommended that Council accept the bid of Martin Bros. Contractors, Inc., in the amount of \$2,349,600.00, (which includes \$2,252,600.00 for the Base Bid, \$67,000.00 for Additive Bid Item No. 5 and \$30,000.00 for Additive Bid Item No. 6), with dates for completion of the respective portions of the project to be as above set forth; and that all other bids received by the City be rejected.

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency ordinance:

**(#35813-041502) AN ORDINANCE** accepting the bid of Martin Bros. Contractors, Inc., for the renovation of existing spaces within the Civic Center Coliseum building to provide new locker rooms, office space and other associated improvements to the infrastructure in relation to the Roanoke Civic Center Expansion and Renovation Phase I Project, upon certain terms and conditions and

awarding a contract therefor; authorizing the proper City officials to execute the requisite contract for such work; rejecting all other bids made to the City for the work; and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 528.)

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35813-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**BUDGET-WATER RESOURCES:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that on February 4, 2002, Council declared that a water supply emergency existed and instituted water conservation measures, which continue as of this date; City staff have conducted studies to determine if there are available projects to provide additional sources of water to try and increase the City's water supply during the water supply emergency; and staff has determined that three specific projects might accomplish this purpose, but to do so, it is imperative that the projects be expedited, which may not allow for the normal procurement methods to be utilized, thus, there is an emergency need to proceed with the projects as soon as possible.

It was further advised that the Utility Department, in conjunction with the City Engineering Office, has been studying various water supply projects to increase the resources available to the City; and three projects have emerged as being technically feasible, with a reasonable chance of being permitted, and can be completed through use of Water Fund retained earnings, as follows:

Completion of the Muse Spring well  
Installation of ultraviolet (UV) treatment equipment at Crystal Spring  
Construction of a well(s) near Crystal Spring

Completion of the Muse Spring Well - The Virginia Department of Health (Health Department) has given its approval to place the Muse Spring well into service through use of temporary equipment pending certification of final construction plans; the original design for the Muse Spring facility envisioned a more extensive operating plant with a storage tank; the modified design will only install a pump, disinfection equipment, and the piping necessary to deliver the water; estimated

cost for this project is \$125,000.00, and it is expected that the project will deliver one million gallons of water a day (mgd), which will help lessen the amount of water taken from Carvins Cove.

**Ultraviolet Treatment at Crystal Spring** - A preliminary engineering report (PER) has been delivered to the Health Department for use of ultraviolet (UV) treatment as a supplement for parasite inactivation until the microfiltration plant is complete; it is anticipated that the Health Department will permit the use of UV treatment, although not until the level in the Carvins Cove Reservoir reaches 30 feet below spillway; the cost is estimated at \$250,000.00; however, by comparison, the cost of buying a combination of water equivalent to four mgd from the City of Salem and Roanoke County is \$230,000.00 per month; and the cost of buying four mgd from Roanoke County, exclusively, is \$330,000.00 per month.

An important consideration with this project is the construction timeline in relation to the installation of the microfiltration plant. Equipment delivery for the UV system is 12 weeks. The microfiltration plant will be operational by December of this year, and could be operational as soon as mid-October. If the Health Department cannot be persuaded to modify its position soon, there will be no reason to install the UV equipment. Quick procurement of the equipment is critical. The Health Department has only approved two vendors to supply this equipment. The authority to negotiate directly with these two vendors is requested in lieu of regular procurement procedures. An early deliver incentive may also be offered to reduce delivery time.

**Well(s) to Supplement Crystal Spring** - After reviewing the geologic survey undertaken by the City in 2000, there is a reasonable possibility that a well (or wells) can be drilled near Crystal Spring in hydrologic zones different from the spring. Crystal Spring delivers between 3.5 and four mgd; however, the existing pumping facility and the microfiltration plant currently being constructed both have the ability to treat and deliver five mgd. The geologic survey work suggests that groundwater resources in the immediate area are sufficient to provide another one mgd. This well water would most likely be classified as “under the influence of surface water” and would require treatment. However, the water could be introduced with the Crystal Spring water for filtration, increasing the plant’s output by 20%. Estimated costs for this option vary with the length of piping needed from the well to the Crystal Spring site, but are not anticipated to exceed \$125,000.00 if existing City-owned property could be used.

If the well water quality is as good as Crystal Spring, this water may also be suitable for UV treatment under the temporary treatment system proposed for Crystal Spring, assuming approval can be obtained to place such a system into operation. It is important to note that wells to supplement the natural flow from Crystal Spring have been tried in the past. Flows from these wells were small with high iron content, making them impractical for use without additional treatment. The geologic survey suggests that deeper wells would yield better quality water, but exploratory drilling is needed for confirmation. Authorization is requested to negotiate directly with the hydrogeologist that completed the previous groundwater survey work for the City for additional consulting and well drilling services.

The City Manager recommended that the Water Fund FY 2001/2002 budget be amended and that Council approve appropriation of \$500,000.00 from the Water Fund Prior Year Retained Earnings into three separate accounts to be established by the Director of Finance to provide design and construction of the three projects; that Council declare that an emergency exists within the meaning of §41 of the City Charter and allow the City Manager to make emergency improvements without following the normal procurement methods to the extent reasonably necessary for the above projects; authorize the City Manager to negotiate directly with the two vendors approved by the Health Department to supply the UV Treatment equipment and to take such further action or to execute such documents as may be necessary to implement and administer the UV Treatment project; authorize the City Manager to negotiate directly with Golder Associates of Richmond, Virginia, to provide consulting and well drilling services and to take such further action, or to execute such documents as may be necessary to implement and to administer the Crystal Spring Supplemental Well project; and authorize the City Manager to take such further action, or to execute such documents as may be necessary, to implement and administer the Muse Spring Well project.

Mr. Carder offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35814-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Water Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 529.)

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35814-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**Mr. Carder offered the following emergency ordinance:**

**(#35815-041502) AN ORDINANCE declaring the existence of an emergency in connection with obtaining certain design services and construction work for certain projects to try to obtain additional sources of water to try to increase the City's water supply to help with the City's water supply emergency that was declared on February 4, 2002, Ordinance No. 35741-020402; providing that due to the need to expedite such projects, the normal procurement method of advertising, conducting competitive negotiations, and/or competitive sealed bidding be dispensed with to the extent reasonably necessary; authorizing the City Manager to take such further action or to execute such documents as may be necessary to implement and administer such projects; and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 530.)**

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35815-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES: None.**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.**

**INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS:**

**BUDGET-REFUSE COLLECTION-EQUIPMENT: Ordinance No. 35791, providing for appropriation of additional funds in connection with refuse collection, having previously been before the Council for its first reading on Monday, April 1, 2002, read and adopted on its first reading and laid over, was again before the body, Mr. Bestpitch offering the following for its second reading and final adoption:**

**(#35791-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 General Fund Appropriations.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 510.)**

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35791-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**BUDGET-CITY COUNCIL:** Mr. Carder offered the following resolution establishing Monday, April 29, 2002 at 2:00 p.m., as a Special meeting of the Council of the City of Roanoke for the purpose of holding public hearings on the General Fund Budget for Fiscal Year 2002-2003, HUD funds, and effective tax increases:

(#35816-041502) A RESOLUTION establishing the date of a Special Meeting of the Council of the City of Roanoke.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 65, page 532 .)

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35816-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

#### **MOTIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

#### **INQUIRIES AND/OR COMMENTS BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL:**

**BUSES-ROANOKE CIVIC CENTER:** Council Member Hudson reiterated previous remarks with regard to using a smaller bus for the employee shuttle from the Roanoke Civic Center to downtown Roanoke.

The Mayor inquired as to the status of a briefing with regard to the transit system; whereupon, it was the consensus of Council that a special meeting of the GRTC Board of Directors will be held on Monday, April 29, 2002, immediately following the Council's work session, which is scheduled to convene at 12:15 p.m., in Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, to discuss transit operations.

**TRAFFIC-COMPLAINTS-ACTS OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT-YOUTH-SCHOOLS:** Council Member Wyatt commended the City Manager for her prompt response to certain questions regarding tattoo parlors in the Williamson Road area. She expressed appreciation to Ms. Marion Vaughn-Howard, Youth Planner, for including students from Westside Elementary School in the Student Government Day Luncheon which was held earlier in the day. She called attention to concerns expressed by owners of businesses located in the Williamson Road area in regard to teenagers congregating at the intersection of Williamson Road and Trinkle Avenue, N. W.

The Mayor expressed concern with regard to teenagers also congregating at Trinkle Avenue and Winsloe Drive, N. W.

**BUDGET-HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER:** Vice-Mayor Carder expressed concern with regard to a decrease in State funding of the Higher Education Center, and that the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committee has encouraged the Higher Education Center to seek funding from the local governments in its primary service area to complement State funding.

**CITY MANAGER COMMENTS:**

**WATER RESOURCES:** As a water conservation tip, the City Manager presented a card that will be supplied to local restaurants for display asking that water be served by request only with meals, and an additional card that hotels are requested to display in hotel rooms in regard to laundering linens and towels.

**HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS:** The Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard; it is also a time for informal dialogue between Council Members and citizens and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for any necessary and appropriate response, recommendation or report to Council.

**COMPLAINTS-HOUSING/AUTHORITY:** Ms. Helen E. Davis, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., advised that residents of Lincoln Terrace appeared before Council in December 2001 and presented their concerns with regard to a request that screen doors be installed on both the front and back doors of their residence. She further advised that a statement was made at the last meeting of Council by a Member of Council that a resolution had been accepted by Lincoln Terrace residents; however, the Council Member is now aware that he was misinformed by the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority. She stated that Council and the City administration has a serious problem if they can not, or will not, hold the Housing Authority accountable for spending Hope VI funds without the provision of screen doors for each residence. She questioned the effectiveness of the Hope VI project for Lincoln Terrace residents if it does not provide freedom of mind from intruders and insects.

At 4:05 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess for one Closed Session.

At 4:55 p.m., the Council meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber with all Members of the Council in attendance except Mr. White, Mayor Smith presiding.

**COUNCIL:** With respect to the Closed Meeting just concluded, Mr. Carder moved that each Member of City Council certify to the best of his or her knowledge that: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in any motion by which any Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----5.

**NAYS:** None-----0.

(Council Member Wyatt was out of the Council Chamber when the vote was recorded.) (Council Member White was absent.)

**OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:** The Mayor advised that there is a vacancy on the Advisory Board of Human Development created by the ineligibility of Bernice F. Jones to serve another term; whereupon, he called for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Mr. Bestpitch placed in nomination the name of Kirk A. Ludwig.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Ludwig was appointed as a member of the Advisory Board of Human Development, for a term ending November 30, 2005, by the following vote:

**FOR MR. LUDWIG:** Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Council Member White was absent.)

At 4:57 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess to be immediately reconvened in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., Roanoke, Virginia.

At 5:00 p.m., the Mayor called the meeting to order for a joint session of City Council and the Board of Zoning Appeals, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith and Chairman Kenneth L. Motley presiding.

**CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., Linda F. Wyatt, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith---6.**

**ABSENT: Council Member William White, Sr.,-----1.**

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEMBERS PRESENT: William D. Poe, Philip H. Lemon, Kermit E. Hale and Chairman Benjamin S. Motley-----5.**

**ABSENT: Board Member Joel M. Richert-----1.**

**STAFF PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham; City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; Mary F. Parker, City Clerk; Steven J. Talevi, Assistant City Attorney and Counsel to the Board of Zoning Appeals; Evelyn D. Dorsey, Zoning Administrator; and Linda R. Leedy, Secretary, Board of Zoning Appeals.**

**At 5:30 p.m., following dinner, the business session was called to order.**

**ZONING:**

**UPDATE ON TRAINING FOR BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEMBERS:**

**Mr. Motley advised that jointly, City Council and the Board of Zoning Appeals, have tried to ensure that the Board is composed of representatives who are motivated and will provide regular attendance. He stated that Board members are currently undergoing certification and every member is a contributing and active representative.**

**He referred to major issues in need of ongoing attention, one of which is the telecommunications ordinance that continues to be a challenge and does not currently address the modern needs of telecommunications in the Roanoke Valley. He stated that the zoning ordinance is currently undergoing a major revision, but in the meantime City staff believes that steps should be taken to address the telecommunications ordinance.**

**The City Manager called attention to the intent to fast track a quick fix to the telecommunications ordinance so as to provide Council with a better understanding on the placement of telecommunications towers; however, there is still a need to follow a more detailed process in connection with zoning. She stated that within the next 60 days, the City Planning Commission will submit a recommendation to Council regarding telecommunications towers and the need to limit the area of the City where they can be located, along with a special exception process.**

**EFFORTS TO MAKE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS PROCEDURES MORE CITIZEN FRIENDLY:**

Mr. Motley advised that the application process has recently been refined to ensure that citizens receive an advance copy of staff remarks pertaining to their application; the Board has requested that fees associated with advertising be reviewed; and most importantly, it is the goal of the Board of Zoning Appeals to ensure that citizens receive a fair hearing by Board members who are attentive, thoughtful and clear on their questions and concerns.

**ZONING ENFORCEMENT:**

Mr. Motley stated that it is not difficult to find zoning violations throughout the City and staff is addressing those concerns. He advised that the Board is serious in terms of what it can do as a Board, and that actions of the Board of Zoning Appeals are carried out. To that end, he stated that the City Attorney's Office has been requested to review certain other issues, one of which is bonding. He stated that the Board is reviewing the big picture and trying to do its best to make the zoning process a healthy procedure for the City.

Mr. Lemon spoke in support of the certification program for Board of Zoning Appeals members.

Mr. Bestpitch referred to a communication from the City Attorney in regard to questions that came up in a recent meeting of the Audit Committee regarding zoning, business licenses, etc., and whether or not a business license can be revoked if there is a zoning violation. He stated that this is another example where computer systems should be interfaced, and inquired if there are other areas that should be explored by the Board of Zoning Appeals, the Zoning Administrator, and the Commissioner of the Revenue to share information and to improve communications and efficiencies.

Ms. Dorsey advised of a future upcoming meeting with the Department of Technology staff and the Commissioner of the Revenue to discuss the interfacing of computer systems; whereupon, and it was suggested that the Director of Real Estate Valuation and the City Treasurer also be included in the discussions.

Vice-Mayor Carder advised that in July, pursuant to a City Charter amendment, membership of the Board of Zoning Appeals may increase from six to seven, following the appropriate amendment of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Harris made the observation that on numerous occasions citizens have retained the services of an attorney when submitting applications to the City Planning Commission and to the Board of Zoning Appeals. He stated that a petitioner should be able to go through the process without having to endure the expense of an attorney and inquired if the process is so complicated that citizens believe the services of an attorney are justified.

Chairman Motley advised that business entities tend to hire an attorney to present their issues; however, the average citizen is not represented by an attorney. He stated that the process is not complicated and the demeanor of the Board of Zoning Appeals is citizen friendly.

The City Manager called attention to significant improvements in the processing of requests to the Board of Zoning Appeals over the past year, staff reports are now provided to the Board and to citizens, and the Zoning Administrator conducts interviews with petitioners to review the procedure.

There being no further business to be discussed, at 6:10 p.m., the Mayor declared the Council meeting in recess to be reconvened at 7:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber.

At 7:00 p.m., on Monday April 15, 2002, the regular meeting of City Council reconvened in the Roanoke City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with the following Council Members in attendance, Mayor Smith presiding.

**PRESENT:** Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., C. Nelson Harris, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith---6.

**ABSENT:** Council Member William White, Sr.-----1.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by Council Member C. Nelson Harris.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**COMMITTEES-SCHOOLS:** Pursuant to Section 9-20.1 Public hearing before appointment of School Board Members, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, April 15, 2002, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, the matter was before the body.

Advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, April 5, 2002 and in The Roanoke Tribune on Thursday, April 11, 2002.

**On July 1, 2002, there will be two vacancies on the Roanoke City School Board for terms ending June 30, 2005. At its meeting on April 1, 2002, Council selected the following persons to receive the public interview on Thursday, April 18, 2002, commencing at 4:30 p.m., in the City Council Chamber:**

**Carl D. Cooper  
Edward Garner  
William H. Lindsey  
William E. Skeen  
Robert J. Sparrow**

**The Mayor inquired if there were persons in attendance who would like to speak to the candidacy of the above listed applicants; whereupon, the following persons spoke:**

**Ms. Susan Finney, 2915 Corbieshaw Road, S. W., spoke in support of the appointment of William H. Lindsey. She advised that she is an active parent in school activities and a PTA Executive Board Member at Grandin Court Elementary School where her son attends; she has known Mr. Lindsey for four years and can attest to the fact that he will be a credible person to assume a position on the School Board and he will make outstanding contributions to the educational system.**

**Ms. Annette Lewis, 4606 Casper Drive, N. E., spoke in support of the appointment of William E. Skeen. She advised that she has known Mr. Skeen for seven years; they not only work for the same employer, but they share the same desire for Roanoke City schools to provide a quality education that equips Roanoke's children with the tools they need to pursue post secondary studies and/or careers. She stated that while working with Mr. Skeen she has found him to possess the following qualities: (1) he is well-organized and always mindful of the need to set priorities in order to accomplish goals; he favors competitive salaries, parental involvement, teacher education and support, new instructional resources, maintaining a low teacher-student ratio, and attention to school violence concerns through development of life-skills program priorities for Roanoke City Schools; (2) he is hard-working and does not shy away from a challenge; when asked what he would do to ensure that Roanoke City maintains a quality school system in light of the fact that State financial support for education is decreasing, he has quickly responded with the need for the School Board to develop and communicate a position that it would stand on, even if it meant recommending something as unpopular as a tax increase; and (3) Mr. Skeen has numerous qualities, but most importantly, he loves and supports his family and speaks with pride about his wife and children; and he is hard-working, but still spends quality time with his family. She stated that this particular attribute is important because she would not want anyone to serve on the School Board who did not know the importance of family and that children need family support, to be loved and nurtured, and to be encouraged as they accomplish great and small tasks. She advised that a vote for William Skeen is a vote for the children of the City of Roanoke.**

**Mr. Jerry L. Dunnavan, 3734 Renfield Drive, S. W., advised that he has a child in the Roanoke City Public School System and he is pleased with the quality of education that his son has received in his first two years of public education. He endorsed the candidacy of William E. Skeen and advised that his participation on the School Board will ensure that the Roanoke City Public School System will continue to provide the best possible educational opportunities and experiences for not only his child but all other students as well. He stated that he was confident in voicing his support for Mr. Skeen who is a co-worker, a fellow community service volunteer, a father, and a friend; his background in banking and finance will be a tremendous asset for a school system that is consistently faced with difficult budgetary and fiscal responsibilities; and his many years of helping to start small and mid size businesses and their efforts to make sound business decisions will be a great resource for a school system that is attempting to attract the best teachers through competitive pay scales, a system that is faced with providing refurbished high school facilities, and a system that is challenged to continually improve. He stated that Mr. Skeen's devotion to make the community a better place for families to live and work is reflected by his many volunteer and professional efforts to enhance the City of Roanoke; and his volunteer efforts are best exemplified by his single handed and tireless efforts to successfully locate a grocery store in an under served area of the City. He added that Mr. Skeen is the father of three boys, all of whom have attended Roanoke City schools; his interest in seeing that each of his sons achieve educational success is rooted in his deep founded beliefs that a sound education is one of the most important keys to success; and having experienced the school system as a parent, Mr. Skeen's commitment to providing an outstanding school system for all citizens is unparalleled. He noted that one of Mr. Skeen's greatest assets is the ability to bring parties with varying interests into a compromise that best serves the challenges at hand; to have this resource on the School Board would ensure that the administration, teachers, City Council, parents, and most importantly the students, would have an advocate who would do what he believes to be in the best interests of all parties, and would bring a strong business, community and personal commitment to his interest in serving on the Roanoke City School Board.**

**Ms. Brenda Hale, 3595 Parkway Drive, S. W., endorsed the candidacy of Carl D. Cooper and William E. Skeen, who are qualified and competent, men of integrity, credibility, and professionalism. She stated that they are devoted family men, college educated men, devoted to their work, they have made a difference in their community, and they are innovative thinkers. She advised that the children are our future, and both Mr. Cooper and Mr. Skeen care passionately about the children of their community and the school system, and are well-qualified to work diligently to make Roanoke's school system even better.**

**Ms. Leigh Mason, 2071 Laurel Woods Drive, Salem, Virginia , spoke in support of the candidacy of Robert J. Sparrow. She called attention to Mr. Sparrow's involvement in the Blue Ridge Montessori School where he showed an interest in the educational progress of all children, he was active in PTA activities, field trips and supported educational goals of the school. She stated that he had a positive attitude toward his and all children, he was supportive of teachers and the overall mission of the school. She advised that Mr. Sparrow is an intelligent, caring and witty individual, who is dedicated to maximizing the educational experience of each child; he relates well to children and adults, and respects them as individuals; he is dependable, reliable, and a positive role model; therefore, she highly recommended Mr. Sparrow without reservation to serve as a member of the Roanoke City School Board.**

**Ms. Anita J. Price, 3101 Willow Road, N. W., President, Roanoke Education Association, which represents 700 members of the Roanoke City Public Schools, endorsed the candidacy of William E. Skeen and Edward Garner. She advised that all five candidates are well qualified and deserving of consideration; the REA based its decision on written and oral responses supplied by all candidates; and the interview panel represented a diverse team of educators, including three reading specialists, a classroom teacher, a guidance counselor, and the Uniserve Director. She stated that Mr. Skeen and Mr. Garner will be assets to the School Board and would cooperate with all involved interests of education.**

**Mr. Mark Petersen, 1210 Penmar Avenue, S. E., spoke in support of the application of Carl D. Cooper. He advised that he has worked with Mr. Copper on the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee and in connection with his local neighborhood organization, as well as other projects throughout the City, such as greenways and neighborhood revitalization. He asked that Council give serious consideration to appointing Mr. Cooper to the School Board.**

**Ms. Brenda McDaniel, 2037 Carter Road, S. W., endorsed the candidacy of William E. Skeen. She advised that she has known Mr. Skeen for many years, they were co-workers at Dominion Bankshares, for the past several years she has known him as a neighbor, and she has appreciated his service as a volunteer in the Greater Raleigh Court Civic League. She stated that as a volunteer, Mr. Skeen gives his all; he is an idea man and a worker bee, which are important attributes to any organization. She noted that regardless of the assignment, Mr. Skeen is an interested, engaged, active and effective participant; he has made important contributions throughout the City for many years; he is dependable, reliable and effective ; he is the father of three sons, and takes an active role in their education and lives; and he is an asset to any organization on which he serves, and will be an asset to the Roanoke City School Board, if appointed.**

**Ms. Darlene Pierce, 721 Staunton Avenue, N. W., endorsed the candidacy of William H. Lindsey. In his capacity as an attorney, she called attention to the assistance that Mr. Lindsey provided to her in connection with a family situation. In addition to being a family man with strong family ties, she stated that he will make a contribution to the School Board through his legal training. She asked that Council give serious consideration to Mr. Lindsey's appointment to the School Board.**

**Mr. Matt Despard, 1934 Avon Road, S. W., spoke in support of the appointment of William E. Skeen to the School Board. He advised that Mr. Skeen has a record of community service which has enabled him to see the community from a wide variety of perspectives, such as economic development, community development, human services, and education. He stated from the perspective of the father of a four year old daughter who will be entering the school system in the near future, in order for the school system to succeed, it needs to maintain a mutually beneficial relationship with the community that it serves, and Mr. Skeen would be an asset in that regard. He added that as the parent of three children who were educated in Roanoke City schools, current adjunct faculty member at Virginia Western Community College, a former banker and a current business administrator, Mr. Skeen has the technical abilities required for the job; he is understanding and hard working; he understands the issues facing the School system, and the need to hire and retain the best and most qualified teachers, while keeping in mind the fiscal issues confronting the City school system; he is hard working and active in the community, and he has never backed away from any of his commitments. If appointed to the School Board, he advised that Mr. Skeen will be knowledgeable about school related issues and he will be an advocate for quality education.**

**Mr. Pink Wimbush, 4420 Glen Ridge Road, N. W., endorsed the candidacy of William E. Skeen. He advised that he has worked with Mr. Skeen on the Total Action Against Poverty Board of Directors, he is a capable, determined and caring individual, who is knowledgeable about issues relating to grants, students and City government. He stated that Mr. Skeen will be an outstanding addition to the School Board if appointed by Council.**

**There being no further speakers, without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that all comments would be received and filed. He noted that Council will vote to fill the two vacancies on the Roanoke City School Board at its regular meeting on Monday, May 6, 2002, at 2:00 p.m.**

**ZONING: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, April 15, 2002, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of Cesar Dominguez that a tract of land located at 325 Jefferson Street, N. E., identified as Official Tax No. 3012801, be rezoned from RM-2, Residential Multi-family Medium Density District, to C-3 Central Business District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the petitioner, the matter was before the body.**

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, March 29, 2002 and Friday, April 5, 2002 and in The Roanoke Tribune on April 4, 2002.

The City Planning Commission submitted a written report recommending that Council approve the request for rezoning, advising that the purpose of the petition is to renovate a deteriorating commercial building for office space.

Mr. Carder offered the following ordinance:

(#35817-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 301, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, to rezone certain property within the City, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 533.)

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35817-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch.

Cesar Dominquez, Petitioner, appeared before Council in support of his request.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons in attendance who would like to speak to the matter; whereupon, Evelyn D. Bethel, 35 Patton, Avenue, N. E., President, Historic Gainsboro Preservation District, Inc., advised that the land in question is included in the Gainsboro Historic District, the community supports the request for rezoning and is pleased that the former "Moses" store will be restored. She commended the petitioner who has shown respect for the community and for his willingness to work with residents in retaining the integrity of the neighborhood.

Ordinance No. 35817-041502 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**ZONING:** Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, April 15, 2002, or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of Michael A. Wells that the rear portion of property located on Virginia Avenue, N. W., designated as Official Tax No. 2761421, be rezoned from RS-3, Residential Single Family District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the

petitioner; and that proffered conditions on a portion of Official Tax No. 2761409, located at the corner of Virginia Avenue and Westside Boulevard that was previously rezoned from RS-3 to C-2 in 1994, pursuant to Ordinance No. 32294-121994, for the purpose of operating an automobile cleaning facility, be repealed and replaced with new conditions, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, March 29, 2002, and Friday, April 5, 2002, and in The Roanoke Tribune on Thursday, April 4, 2002.

A report of the City Planning Commission recommending that the request be denied was before Council.

Mr. Hudson offered the following ordinance:

(#35818) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 276, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, in order to amend, repeal or replace certain proffered conditions, accepted by City Council by Ordinance No. 32294-121994, presently binding upon Official Tax No. 2761409, and rezoning such Official Tax No. 2761409, from RS-3, Residential Single Family, Low Density District, and C-2, General Commercial District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant; and rezoning Official Tax No. 2761421 from RS-3, Residential Single Family, Low Density District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons in attendance who would like to speak; whereupon, the following persons appeared before Council.

Mr. Jeff Murphy, 538 Stonybrook Road, Wertz, Virginia, advised that his business is located across the street from Mr. Wells' business; he has known Mr. Wells for approximately seven years, and he operates his business in a professional manner. He stated that expansion of the business would be good for the City, it would provide Mr. Wells with more room to operate his business, he has made improvements in the appearance of his property, and his business is well maintained.

**Mr. Daniel M. Hale, Jr., 4425 Aleva Street, N. W., spoke in support of the request of Mr. Wells. He encouraged Council to approve the request because Mr. Wells is a small business man and cannot afford to retain the services of an attorney to present his request to Council. He asked that Council take into consideration the improvements to the area as a result of Mr. Wells business and provide him with the opportunity to expand on the rear of the structure that runs parallel to Melrose Avenue.**

**Mr. Larry Hubbard, 3905 Virginia Avenue, N. W., spoke on behalf of Mr. Wells request. He stated that the business is well maintained and is an attribute to the community.**

**Mr. Fred Galloway, 3402 Kershaw Road, N. W., spoke in support of the request of Mr. Wells. He stated that he frequently passes Mr. Wells business; loud noise and people congregating does not appear to be a problem, and the business is well maintained. He added that it would be an asset to the community for Mr. Wells to expand his business and instead of boarding up buildings, the City should encourage continued use of existing buildings.**

**Mr. Jomoso Worrell, 3818 Virginia Avenue, N. W., advised that Mr. Wells business is an asset to the community, and spoke in support of the need for the small businessman to make money.**

**Mr. Bestpitch advised that the ordinance before Council is not to rezone Mr. Wells, but it is about a property or parcel of land that will not be owned by Mr. Wells forever; however, the decision of Council regarding the rezoning will remain in effect. He stated that there is no known shortage of C-2 property in the area surrounding Mr. Wells business; and although he supports Mr. Wells as a small businessman, he cannot support the rezoning as requested.**

**Mr. Carder advised that expansion by 20 feet will not be an impairment; therefore, he supports the request for rezoning.**

**Ms. Wyatt advised that when Mr. Wells initially approached the City to rezone the property, he was seen as a struggling young businessman. She stated that the last time Council granted an exception for expansion of Mr. Wells' business, he made certain promises that that would be the last exception he would request of the City; however, he has on several occasions returned to the Council with additional requests to expand his business. She advised that she could not support the request of Mr. Wells to further expand his business and feels compelled to hold Mr. Wells to his word.**

**Mr. Hudson advised that he supports the request of Mr. Wells who is a small businessman and should be given the 20 feet to expand his business.**

The Mayor advised that Mr. Wells has operated his business for seven plus years, he has proven his success in a business where there have been failures, and he respects an individual who can perform accordingly. He stated that he respects the remarks of Council Member Bestpitch that there is nearby vacant land, however, if that option were affordable, Mr. Wells would have relocated his business. He stated that he visited the business establishment and found all aspects to be in order, which is justification to encourage Mr. Wells to continue the success of his business.

Inasmuch as five affirmative votes are required to adopt an ordinance dispensing with the second reading, Ordinance No. 35818 was lost by the following vote:

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----4.**

**NAYS: Council Members Bestpitch and Wyatt-----2.**

(Council Member White was absent.)

Mr. Hudson moved that Ordinance No. 35818 be amended to delete the words “and dispensing with the second reading of the ordinance.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted, Council Members Wyatt and Bestpitch voting no.

Mr. Hudson moved that Ordinance No. 35818 be placed upon its first reading:

(#35818) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 276, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, in order to amend, repeal or replace certain proffered conditions, accepted by City Council by Ordinance No. 32294-121994, presently binding upon Official Tax No. 2761409, and rezoning such Official Tax No. 2761409, from RS-3, Residential Single Family, Low Density District, and C-2, General Commercial District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant; and rezoning Official Tax No. 3761421 from RS-3, Residential Single Family, Low Density District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----4.**

**NAYS: Council Members Bestpitch and Wyatt-----2.**

(Council Member White was absent.)

**ENTERPRISE ZONE:** Pursuant to instructions by Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, April 15, 2002, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, to consider amendments to the City's Enterprise Zone Program, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Sunday, March 31, 2002 and Sunday, April 7, 2002.

The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the City's Enterprise Zone One (formerly called the Roanoke Urban Enterprise Zone) was designated by the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1984, with limited local incentives; enterprise Zone Two and the 581/Hershberger Subzone were established in 1996 and 1998, respectively; by Ordinance No. 33019-070196, Council established certain local incentives for Enterprise Zone Two, which applied to the Subzone when it was established in 1998; by Ordinance No. 34412-071999, Council made the local incentives of each Enterprise Zone applicable to the other Enterprise Zone to the extent that they were not unique to one Enterprise Zone; and by Ordinance No. 35414-061801, Council extended the availability of such local incentives through December 31, 2003, when Enterprise Zone One will either terminate, or be extended by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

It was further advised that in 2001, the City Department of Economic Development completed an evaluation of the Enterprise Zone local incentives; the Department concluded that amendments to local incentives should be made to increase effectiveness of the program; and amendments propose to accomplish the following:

Expand the availability of rebates for water, fire, and sewer hookup fees and for building permits and comprehensive development plan review fees to include rehabilitation work in addition to new building construction;

To extend the availability of the local incentives for the Enterprise Zones from December 31, 2003 to June 30, 2007;

To add a local incentive to provide limited funds for partial grants for the cost of certain building facade renovations within Enterprise Zone One; and

To modify and/or extend certain funding limits in connection with certain local incentives.

It was noted that the amended incentives will be applicable to Enterprise Zones One and Two (including the Subzone for Two) except as noted above, and would be effective July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2007, unless extended, and provided, however, that the local incentives for Enterprise Zone One may terminate if that Enterprise Zone is not extended by the Commonwealth of Virginia and terminates on December 31, 2003; funding for the incentives will be necessary until the end of the life of the incentives, July 1, 2007, unless otherwise extended; the Department of Economic Development has sufficient funds to capitalize the Facade Grant incentive for at least one year, as well as \$15,000.00 for other incentives; and additional funds may be needed in the future, depending on the demand for the incentives.

Lacking comments at the public hearing that would require further consideration, the City Manager recommended that Council amend the appropriate measures to establish the above-mentioned local incentives, subject to approval by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (VDHCD) with an effective date of July 1, 2002; that Council authorize the City Manager to apply to the VDHCD for approval of local incentive amendments, to add the local incentive, and to take such further action and/or execute such additional documents as may be necessary to obtain or confirm such local incentives and to establish appropriate rules and regulations to implement and administer such local incentives once approved; funding of \$80,000.00 is currently available in Account No. 008-310-9736-9132, Enterprise Zone Local Incentives, which account name should be changed to "Facade Grant Program" to more accurately reflect the planned use of the funds; that Council approve transfer of \$20,000.00 from Account No. 008-310-9735-9132 to Account No. 008-310-9736-9132 (Facade Grant Program); and transfer \$15,000.00 from Account No. 008-310-9735-9132 to an account to be established by the Director of Finance for water, sewer and fire hookup fee rebates, as well as building permit and comprehensive plan review fee rebates.

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35819-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Capital Projects Funds Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 535.)

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35819-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to speak to the matter. There being none, Ordinance No. 35819-041502 was adopted by the following vote:

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**Mr. Carder offered the following emergency ordinance:**

**(#35820-041502) AN ORDINANCE amending Ordinance No. 33019-070196, adopted by City Council on July 1, 1996, which established certain local incentives for the area designated as Enterprise Zone Two in the City by modifying it to delete paragraphs 4 and 5 and substituting the paragraphs 4 and 5 set forth below to extend the incentive rebates set forth therein to include rehabilitation work in addition to new building construction and to modify the percent of rebates available and that such modified incentives will be applicable from July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2007, and also modifying and/or extending certain funding limits in connection with certain local incentives in that ordinance; amending Ordinance No. 35414-061801, adopted by Council on June 18, 2001, which extended the availability of local incentives through December 31, 2003, by modifying it to extend such local incentives through June 30, 2007; adding a local incentive to provide limited funds for partial grants for the cost of certain building facade renovations only within Enterprise Zone One; authorizing the City Manager to apply to the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (VDHCD) for the approval of the above amendments and/or to take such further action as may be necessary to obtain or confirm those amendments; and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 536.)**

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35820-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----0.**

**(Council Member White was absent.)**

**ZONING:** Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, April 15, 2002, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard on the request of the Rescue Mission of Roanoke, Inc., that 3.56 acres of land, more or less, consisting of 25 parcels generally located on Tazewell Avenue, Fourth Street and Dale Avenue, S. E., be rezoned from RM-2, Residential Multifamily, Medium Density District and C-2, General Commercial District, to INPUD, Institutional Planned Unit Development District, subject to certain proffered conditions, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, March 29, 2002 and Friday, April 5, 2002, and in The Roanoke Tribune on Thursday, April 4, 2002.

A report of the City Planning Commission advising that the purpose of the proposed zoning change is to expand the existing Rescue Mission facilities to include a new building for services to women and children and an infirmary; the existing facility currently provides approximately 200 beds allocated to the Men's Transient Program (101 beds), Men's Recovery Shelter (39 beds), Women's Transient Program (10 beds) and a Family Shelter (48 beds); some of the existing programs are proposed to move to the new building; and the new facility is proposed to include the following programs: Women's Residential Recovery Program (14 units/24 beds), Female Transient Program (1 unit/10 beds), Family Shelter (12 units/48 beds), Infirmary (2 units/ 12 beds), and residential staff (2 units); and the rezoning request is being considered concurrently with a request to close four alleys in the vicinity of Tazewell Avenue, Dale Avenue and 4<sup>TH</sup> Street, S. E., was before Council.

The City Planning Commission recommended approval of the request for rezoning to INPUD for the purpose of expanding the Rescue Mission facility; Planning Commission members in support of the request cited the need for human services facilities, including a women's and children facility; expansion would not adversely impact the neighborhood because there is currently an existing facility and expansion is not considered to be clustering; those Commission members opposed to the request cited clustering of the shelters in the area; effects on the residential neighborhood expansion was not in conformance with preliminary recommendations of the neighborhood plan; and past demolitions and new construction did not enhance and protect the historic neighborhood.

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following ordinance:**

**(#35821-041502) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 401, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, to rezone certain property within the City, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 542.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35821-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder.**

**The Mayor inquired if there were persons in attendance who would like to speak to the matter; whereupon the following persons addressed Council:**

**Jean Edmunds, Chaplain, Roanoke City/County Jails, advised that there are approximately 100 women in the City Jail and 50 in the County Jail this evening, many of whom are serving time for drug-related crimes and have small children at home; and as a Chaplain, one of the saddest things she hears is the guilt that these women feel because they are separated from their children; therefore, jail is not the answer for these addicts. She called attention to a young woman who was incarcerated for over a year, who had three children, but when she was released from jail, she returned less than six hours later on a charge of crack/cocaine. She advised that saying no to drugs is not the only answer for drug addicts because they need specialized treatment, self-examination, education in the reasons for their drug abuse and how to stay away from drugs. She stated that unfortunately, simply attending church is not the answer, and in her ministry she explains that God works in many ways in addition to the 11:00 a.m. Sunday morning worship service and that God works through treatment which is the purpose of the Roanoke Rescue Mission program, by incorporating both the spiritual aspect of recovery with specialized treatment. She asked that Council rezone the property so that the Rescue Mission may continue its services to women in need.**

**Audrey Wheaton, 1324D Essex Avenue, N. W., President of the Board of Directors of the Roanoke Rescue Mission, advised that the Rescue Mission has a wonderful history in the Roanoke Valley; thousands of lives have been touched and changed for the better; ten years ago there was a realization that there was a genuine need for a shelter for women who were addicted to drugs and alcohol where they could keep their young children with them while receiving treatment, and plans were initiated to make this a reality, surveys were conducted, public meetings were held at the Rescue Mission, the Southeast Presbyterian Center, Belmont Christian Church, the old fire station on Jamison Avenue, and walking tours have been conducted throughout the area. She stated that input has been sought from the Southeast Action Forum, the Southeast Christian Partnership and Faith Works; meetings have been held with the City Manager; and schematic drawings have been**

changed on several occasions to accommodate community input. She stated that the Rescue Mission has tried in every way to address the concerns of the citizens of southeast; construction of the facility will not involve City funds; and many lives will be rescued from a life of despair and degradation. On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Rescue Mission, she urged that Council support the construction of the shelter for women and children by approving the rezoning request.

Ms. Marion McConnell, 2407 Avenham Avenue, S. W., appeared before Council as a citizen of the City of Roanoke, a volunteer of the Rescue Mission, and on behalf of the Veterans Administration Medical Care Center. She advised that the Rescue Mission has long been involved in utilizing volunteers to make the southeast neighborhood a better place; over the past six years, the Rescue Mission, along with the Southeast Action Forum and the Southeast Christian Partnership have sponsored Clean Sweep in an effort to clean up southeast streets and alleys; and recently 116 volunteers logged over 208 hours and collected 145 bags of trash, 16 tires and 2½ truckloads of refuse. She stated that she personally volunteered 60 days at the Rescue Mission through the VA Medical Care Center, because the Medical Care Center fully supports the efforts of the Rescue Mission, especially in view of the fact that approximately 34% of Rescue Mission guests are veterans. Therefore, she encouraged Council to support the request for rezoning.

Ms. Barbara Shelton, 414 Arbor Avenue, S. E., advised that she has lived in southeast Roanoke for 26 years; she has served as a volunteer at the Rescue Mission and through the years she has seen the Rescue Mission respond to the needs of the neighborhood by always offering a helping hand. She advised that many families in Roanoke have been served by the Rescue Mission, and asked that Council support the request for rezoning.

Mr. Bill Branch, 4552 Franklin Road, S. W., addressed the matter from a land use standpoint. When looking at the area requested to be rezoned, along with existing businesses between Fourth Street and Rt. 581, he advised that there is a car wash, a paint store, a printing contractor, System Four building, a thrift store, a glass store and an establishment with heavy equipment outside. With any type of planning, he explained that it is important to have some kind of transition between businesses and single family residences, and the proposed Rescue Mission expansion would provide an ideal transition. He stated that the proposed building would provide a visual barrier between residences, a pleasing visual site from I-581 and an ideal use for the land in question. He recommended that Council approve the request for rezoning.

Mr. John P. Bradshaw, 3132 Burnleigh Road, S. W., former member of the City Planning Commission, advised that at the Planning Commission hearing, he took exception to the original staff report which indicated that the proposal was contrary to the newly drafted comprehensive plan. He stated that having attended most, if not all of the public drafting sessions that formulated the current comprehensive plan, he can attest to a number of objectives that the document recommended for the

good of the City; and the services provided and currently proposed by the Rescue Mission are clearly included in the plan. He noted that the importance of the neighborhood was stressed in the comprehensive plan, but not at the exclusion of any other defined City objective; the comprehensive plan recognized the potential of conflicting objectives, and included a section addressing those types of occurrences. He stated that there is another issue relative to the applicability of the comprehensive plan's objectives for maintaining the quality of the existing neighborhood relative to the Rescue Mission proposal, and questioned whether the Rescue Mission is truly an element of the neighborhood or merely a fringe activity; and its location and function is more akin to the immediately adjacent downtown neighborhood than to the residential setting on the other side of the cemetery. He called attention to a parking garage on Williamson Road, a glass repair and warehouse operation zoned light manufacturing, a City parking lot, railroad tracks, I-581, and a series of vacant lots, etc., none of which are residential in nature, which indicate that this is not a residential neighborhood, but a fringe to the residential neighborhood. He noted that from a functional viewpoint, the Rescue Mission provides a service to the City that is closely related to the adjacent core City, which is the reason the facility was initially placed in its current location a number of years ago.

Mr. Sidney Miller, 3745 Heritage Road, S. W., advised that a picture is worth a thousand words, and as Construction Chairman of the Rescue Mission, he presented a photograph of a house on the corner of Fourth Street and Bullitt Avenue which is located in close proximity to the proposed Rescue Mission building. He compared the condition of the structure before the Rescue Mission acquired the property to its present condition.

Ms. Susie Donovan, 402 4<sup>th</sup> Street, S. E., appeared before Council in support of the request for rezoning for the sake of the children of recovering drug addicts. She stated that children of addicted mothers do not get the opportunity to be kids because they are forced into the role of parent; one such child is a ten year old boy who played the role of parent to not only his mother, but to his four month old brother, and the final act he performed as parent to his mother was trying to wake her, when she did not respond, he telephoned 911 and was later told that his mother was dead as the result of a drug overdose. She advised that the Rescue Mission's recovery program could have saved the mothers's life; therefore, she requested that Council vote yes to the rezoning for the sake of the children who are affected.

Ms. Mary K. Bayse, 3138 Hidden Oak Road, S. W., spoke in support of the rezoning request. She called attention to the significant investment of the Rescue Mission to the southeast neighborhood; the Rescue Mission has spent to date in excess of \$8 million on its current properties; the Rescue Mission has been careful about the appearance of its properties by using brick structures and attractive landscaping, and property is well maintained. She stated that the Rescue Mission is a good neighbor and has been a good neighbor in southeast Roanoke for over 30 years; the Mission has consistently led efforts to keep the neighborhood safe and clean; and no other organization has demonstrated this level of commitment to the southeast neighborhood. She asked that Council support the request for rezoning.

**Ms. Tamiko Franklin, 402 4<sup>th</sup> Street, S. E., a recovering addict who had to leave the Roanoke Valley in order to find treatment, appeared before Council in support of the request. She advised that she is the mother of seven children, drug treatment programs in the Roanoke area did not allow her children to be with her, or she had to wait long periods of time in order to see her children, therefore, as a result, she left the drug recovery programs and again became a drug user; and five of her children are now being raised by the State. She advised that when she became pregnant with her sixth child, she left Virginia and moved to Connecticut where she was allowed to go into drug treatment, to deliver her baby, and to bring her baby back to the treatment facility. By allowing her to bring her child home, she stated that it gave her the incentive to do what she had to do in order to raise the child. She requested that Council help women like herself to do the right thing so that they will not be forced to leave the Roanoke Valley to find the help they need.**

**Mr. B. Don Johnson, 429 Penn Road, Floyd County, Virginia, a member of the Board of Directors of the Roanoke Rescue Mission, advised that the Rescue Mission plans to construct an infirmary that will provide a safe, clean place for women to recover, because many people receiving medical attention are discharged to the streets or to unsanitary conditions. He called attention to the importance of providing a safe, secure and nurturing environment for the children that will be helped by the program many of whom are in the most critical learning periods of their life. He requested that Council look with favor on the rezoning of the property, thereby allowing expansion of the Roanoke Rescue Mission program.**

**Ms. Phyllis Dickerson, 402 4<sup>th</sup> Street, S. E., spoke on behalf of the Rescue Mission's recovery program for women and children. She advised that there is no quick fix for recovery from drug and alcohol abuse; these women have been caught in the cycle of abuse for years and cannot make the lifestyle changes that are necessary to break the cycle in a short period of time because they must change the way they think, the way they act, and the way they feel which is not an overnight process. She stated that at a time when funding is being cut for alternative programs, the Rescue Mission is willing to invest the time and the necessary resources to help women and their children make the needed lifestyle changes; and the longer they spend learning how to live without drugs and alcohol, the better their chances will be of making a permanent lifestyle change and breaking the cycle of drug abuse. She urged that Council vote in favor of the Rescue Mission expansion.**

**Ms. Margaret Preston, 402 4<sup>th</sup> Street, S. E., appeared before Council in support of the Rescue Mission's Recovery Program for Women and Children, which is a program that is especially important for women who have no insurance, who survive on low incomes and suffer from the disease of substance abuse. She advised that there are no long term, faith based recovery programs in the Roanoke Valley; and as a woman of color, she is especially concerned about the single mothers with**

children in her community who are victims of this disease. She requested that Council vote in favor of the Rescue Mission expansion program so that these women and their children will receive the help they need and the cycle of substance abuse can be broken.

Ms. Sharon McCroskey, 402 4<sup>th</sup> Street, S. E., advised that she has been free of drugs and alcohol for three years due to a 20 month treatment program that she received. She explained that she previously tried to get help in Roanoke to no avail; she called numerous treatment centers and was turned away because of lack of insurance, and with budget cuts, it will be even harder for women to get help with their drug addiction. She stated that if more recovery programs for women and children are not provided, the cycle of drug and alcohol abuse will continue; women will die, children will be raised by the State, and the crime rate will escalate. She advised that the Rescue Mission employs God-loving people who want to make a difference, and she can think of no better place than the Rescue Mission for women to begin recovery and to receive help in becoming productive citizens of society. She asked that Council Members vote in favor of the request.

Ms. Nancy Brenneman, 4898 Raimy Lane, Salem, Virginia, read a communication from Ms. Holly Pugh, 404 Bullitt Avenue, S. E., who has owned her home since 1971, and supports the women and children's shelter proposed for construction on Fourth Street, S. E., because the proposed building will be an enhancement to the neighborhood. She advised that since the facility is proposed to be located close to her home, she feels more secure knowing that the facility will be monitored around the clock by Rescue Mission staff. Ms. Pugh advised that the Rescue Mission has helped her family in the past, as well as many other persons in the Roanoke Valley, and will continue to help those in need in the future.

Mr. Courtney Hoge, 3027 Golf Colony Drive, Salem, Virginia, advised that as an emergency shelter for families, children, women and men, the Rescue Mission provides a valuable service by serving 211,000 meals annually and provides over 50,000 nights of lodging, which is valued at over \$3.5 million and the costs would be overwhelming if residential recovery programs and a free clinic for the homeless were added in. He stated that the Rescue Mission performs all of these services without federal, state or local funding; therefore, he spoke in support of the Rescue Mission program which helps to provide a better way of life for some of the Roanoke Valley's citizens.

Mr. Thomas Markwood, 804 Welton Avenue, S. W., advised that the Roanoke Rescue Mission provided 599 hours of volunteer trash pickup in the southeast neighborhood in 2001 and 308 volunteer cleanup hours have been logged for the year 2002 and each week volunteer groups canvas the neighborhood to pick up trash to ensure that all residents enjoy a clean environment. He stated that the women and children who will be helped in the new facility will not be contributors to the concerns that southeast residents have expressed. He asked that Council approve the request for rezoning so that the treatment facility for women and their children will become a reality.

**Mr. Earl Elkins, 921 Tazewell Avenue, S. E., spoke in support of the request of the Rescue Mission which offers a helping hand to those in need. He asked that Council approve the request for rezoning which will provide for construction of the new treatment facility.**

**Mr. Richard Nichols, 1620 Kirk Avenue, S. E., Vice-President of the Southeast Action Forum, advised that the Forum was instructed by a previous Mayor to work with the Rescue Mission and that the Rescue Mission should work with the Southeast Action Forum to address concerns regarding the expansion of the facility. He stated that the Rescue Mission has contributed to the southeast community by cleaning up the area and the Rescue Mission continues to do so on a daily basis. He stated that the alleys proposed for closure will help to deter crime, the City will no longer have to maintain the alleys, and the proposed expansion will be an enhancement to the community. He advised that the Southeast Action Forum is supportive of the Rescue Mission as a good neighbor and the addition of the women's shelter.**

**Ms. Christine Proffitt, 424 Bullitt Avenue, S. E., appeared before Council in an effort to support, promote and protect neighborhood preservation, but also in opposition to the proposed rezoning of residential land and the closure of public alleys by the Rescue Mission due to quality of life, violation of the historic nature of the area, integrity of the neighborhood, and diminishing the historic value. She stated that downtown Roanoke is surrounded by Old Southwest, Historic Gainsboro, and Historic Belmont; historic properties are an asset to the City; historic buildings and homes are unique and attractive and give the City character; and as elected officials, Council should want to preserve historic properties, but it appears that the City continues to allow non-profits and businesses to tear at the fabric of the southeast community. She stated that the gateway into southeast Roanoke, Bullitt Avenue and Jamison Avenue, which connects downtown, Vinton and Smith Mountain Lake, lost 26 historic homes, because there was a plan for the residential property; there is vacant land that has lost tax revenue; the Belmont neighborhood surrounding the Roanoke Rescue Mission was intact in 1995, however, since that time, another 15 historic properties have been razed, again raping the neighborhood of its historic residential value. She questioned how much more stress can be placed on this low income, struggling neighborhood, and noted that seven years ago, the Belmont neighborhood was in a state of disrepair, with no investment by the City, its residents, the Southeast Action Forum, or the Roanoke Rescue Mission. She stated that Council, as elected officials, are charged with the responsibility to ensure quality of life, not only for downtown, but for every neighborhood; and she along with her neighbors have been working with the system for over five years and they have tried to allow the system to work, but other people are playing outside the system which is not fair. She advised that since this small, but vocal group, in opposition to the Rescue Mission expansion went public with regard to inappropriate behavior, much unChristian behavior has taken place by this faith-**

based organization. She stated that the City recommended a community planning process, however, the process was not honest and Rescue Mission planners tried to sell the Mission's plans, which was not a legitimate effort to bring southeast residents into discussions. She added that their concerns were ignored; therefore, they submitted a letter on September 13, 2000, to address the Rescue Mission Board of Directors in order to directly express concerns regarding present operations and proposed expansion; however, residents have not to date been given the opportunity to address the Board of Directors. She noted that on October 16, 2000, neighborhood residents brought their concerns to Council; on October 24, 2000, Rescue Mission staff and officers of the Southeast Action Forum conspired together and called an illegal special meeting to expel neighborhood residents who stood in opposition, accusing residents of being a conflict to the neighborhood, and the Rescue Mission infiltrated the Southeast Action Forum with 17 new members. She stated that the Rescue Mission has no concern for the neighborhood; if they did, they would have preserved the historic homes and used them for the treatment facility for women and children; and the rezoning of residential land is a done deal, even though the surrounding neighborhood is in opposition. She advised that the fact that the City of Roanoke appears to be supportive of the Rescue Mission has seriously broken the trust level of the community, and it saddens her to know that the City has not remained impartial.

Ms. Cassandra Anderson, 424 Bullitt Avenue, S. E., advised she lives one block away from the Roanoke Rescue Mission; the proposed expansion of the Rescue Mission is an outrageous idea, although it is commendable to build a new facility that will help women and children, but residents of southeast have experienced far too many problems as a result of the Rescue Mission; therefore, the facility should be constructed at a location where there are no families with children. She stated that the expansion is supposed to help people, but questioned how it will help the neighborhood. She called attention to litter, harassment of persons residing in the area, and undesirable persons congregating in the neighborhood. She stated that the neighborhood is striving to correct existing problems, and expanding the Rescue Mission will undermine the progress that has taken place. She noted that expansion of the facility is not fair to the residents of southeast Roanoke who will have to increase their efforts to clean up their neighborhood, and parents are afraid to let their children play outside. She stated that the proposed facility should be constructed at a location that is not in close proximity to residential property.

Ms. Corinne Profitt, 424 Bullitt Avenue, S. E., advised that she lives in the Belmont district of southeast. She stated that she addressed Council on October 16, 2000, with concerns of vagrants drinking in public, littering of streets and alleys, and a severe safety problem that has been neglected by the City. She stated that southeast residents came to Council for help, but nothing was done other than to ignore the problem and allow it to continue.

**Mr. Micky Pritchard, 1616 Campbell Avenue, S. E., spoke in opposition to the rezoning and the closure of alleys for the benefit of the Roanoke Rescue Mission.**

**Mr. Bobby Meadows, 410 Bullitt Avenue, S. E., advised that the Roanoke Rescue Mission has touched many lives in the Roanoke Valley; residents are not opposed to the day to day operations; however, they are opposed to the transient program that affects the quality of life in the neighborhood. He stated that the issue is not with women and children, but the inability of the facility to control its clients; and the Board of Directors and administration of the Rescue Mission facility should be held accountable for the actions of its clients. He noted that when the issue first became public, the neighborhood was told that no one in the Roanoke Valley offered a full-time program for women with children; however, it was later learned that Bethany Hall has provided this service for over 30 years; therefore, he asked that the City encourage Bethany Hall to expand its facility and encourage the Rescue Mission to construct single family homes in accordance with current zoning. He stated that the City's Comprehensive Plan states that publicly assisted housing and shelters will be equitably distributed in all parts of the region; the INPUD ordinance calls for development to be harmonious with existing surrounding land uses; however, the current facility does not meet that requirement, and residents of southeast would support the women and children's shelter if the current Rescue Mission facility was a harmonious development; and after years of deception and aggressive tactics toward residents, trust has been lost. He urged City Council to abide by the City's Comprehensive Plan and that the neighborhood plan be in place before approval of site plans or rezoning are authorized. He stated that proposed plans call for a large facility that will back up to single family homes; there is a need for a buffer and a transition area so that neighborhood streets will continue to be viable; and the Rescue Mission architect and the Board of Directors should work with residents to approve buffering, to make the building facing the neighborhood more compatible, and to monitor behavior issues. He advised that the Rescue Mission should fund four new police officers to help relieve some of the tax burden created by the organization. He pointed out that based on these facts, the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee voted to not support the Rescue Mission expansion at its meeting on February 20; a staff report to the City Planning Commission did not support the petition in its current form; and the President's Council stood firm with regard to neighborhood solidarity and does not support the expansion, citing the rationale that this is not only a Belmont issue, but an issue for every inner City neighborhood.**

**Mr. Ricky Nelson, 1319 Tazewell Avenue, S. E., advised that he recently moved to the City of Roanoke from South Carolina in the hopes of finding a new and wonderful life in the southeast area; and as someone living near the Rescue Mission, he often has second thoughts about his decision due to day to day crime, drugs and the fears that he and his neighbors are forced to endure. He asked that he and his neighbors be reassured that living in any area of Roanoke is a good**

decision to make; many persons in attendance this evening and speaking in favor of the request do not live near the Rescue Mission and invited them to move to southeast, to become his neighbor and to live with the fears that he and his neighbors experience every day. For the protection of the neighborhood, he requested that the rezoning be denied.

Ms. Helen E. Davis, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., advised that the inner cities have become invisible, with poverty, crime and decay in Roanoke's oldest neighborhoods. She referred to a publication written in 1997 which indicated that since 1975, the City of Roanoke has received more than \$49.1 million in Community Development Block Grant funds from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Federal law states that the money is to be used to create housing and jobs for the poor; Roanoke City used 37% of its Community Development Block Grant funds on economic development for industrial parks, the Hotel Roanoke and Conference Center and downtown parking garages; these projects have provided very few jobs for the poor; and this is the main reason that inner cities are suffering from decay. She advised that the City of Roanoke has been warned repeatedly to save old housing stock and older neighborhoods, or the entire City will suffer; and residential neighborhoods are the foundation of the City, a City of neighborhoods according to administrative officials. She stated that she was not speaking against the program of the Rescue Mission, but about residential property which should not be encroached upon. She asked that Council support its own statements, and urged that Council help the historic Belmont Preservation Association in its quest to keep its residential neighborhood intact.

Mr. John McGonigel, 706 Montrose Avenue, S. E., stated that even though the Belmont Neighborhood Association believes that the proposed drug unit and infirmary would best serve the women and children and surrounding neighborhood at another location, they are not against this needed ministry; and as an individual who has been involved with various ministries including chapel service at the Rescue Mission, he supports any true ministry of God because there is a need to reach out to the downtrodden and homeless who need and want to be restored to a meaningful purpose in life. However, he advised that there is another group of people who need to be considered, who are the forgotten residents of the west Belmont neighborhood, who virtually have no voice in the process; their neighborhood is on the line and they, like other areas in the northwest and southwest quadrants, are fighting for their survival; and they need help to save what is left of their neighborhood. He stated that no special interest group should have a free hand on any neighborhood; just as the Rescue Mission has made differences in the lives of people, residents of Belmont have made a significant difference through cleaner streets, yards, upgrading of houses, and curbing criminal activity; and the heroes of the homeless are the staff and volunteers of the Rescue Mission, but the real voices and heroes of the neighborhood are the officers and members of the Belmont Neighborhood Association who are committed to the protection,

preservation and well-being of their neighborhood in spite of overwhelming odds against them. He stated that based upon periodicals, a correlated scrapbook of photographs, and documented videos of criminal activity in the Belmont area, it is recommended that City officials tour the area to view existing conditions which will provide a better understanding of the reasons why residents of the west Belmont neighborhood feel threatened and oppose the rezoning of property located at 4th Street and Dale Avenue for the proposed treatment facility.

Ms. Caroline Camilleri, 1012 Morehead Avenue, S. E., appeared before Council in opposition to the rezoning and closing of alleys by the Rescue Mission. She stated that since the male vagrant population is declining, the Rescue Mission should use that space for women and their children. She added that the Rescue Mission should construct houses on those lots where the homes were previously razed that will be compatible with the neighborhood for occupancy by families in need of housing assistance until they are able to become self-sufficient.

Ms. Teresa Kidd, 902 Penmar Avenue, S. E., advised that from the viewpoint of a mother who has had a child taken away and later having been reunited with that child, it is the hardest thing that a mother can endure, and she sympathizes with any woman on the street who cannot get help and is forced to give her child to the state. As a member of the Southeast Action Forum Executive Board, she spoke in support of the request of the Rescue Mission, and advised that the neighborhood will benefit from the rezoning, and the Rescue Mission will work with southeast residents toward a successful conclusion. She explained that currently there is only one program for women in the Roanoke area, and if the program is full, women are forced back on the streets to face the same problems; however, more programs are offered for men, which is discriminatory. She stated that the City of Roanoke is supposed to be an All America City and citizens should help each other.

Ms. Carolyn Nolan, 3008 Maywood Road, S. W., a member of the Advisory Board of the Rescue Mission Healthcare Center, advised that the new treatment center will include a 12 bed infirmary for members of the homeless population who need healthcare and specialized nursing care for a short period of time who do not need to be in the hospital, but may need to be kept in an isolated setting. She called attention to a similar care facility in Savannah, Georgia, consisting of a 32-bed respite care center, which reports in its first year of operation, that hospitals were saved in the range of \$9.5 million and Medicaid saved \$1.3 million. She stated that the Rescue Mission expansion program will help the uninsured to receive the short term medical help they need, and it will help to keep insurance premiums at a lower rate.

Mr. Lee Clark, 1408 West Drive, S. W., spoke in support of the Rescue Mission expansion project.

**Mr. R. J. Musel, 12748 Dickerson Mill Road, Moneta, Virginia, spoke on behalf of the Roanoke Rescue Mission. He stated that the Rescue Mission has touched the lives of thousands of people over the years; the new facility will provide a much needed service; and the Rescue Mission has helped to improve the southeast neighborhood and will continue to do so. He urged that Council vote to rezone the property as requested by the Rescue Mission.**

**Ms. Joy S. Johnson, 421 Bullitt Avenue, S. E., spoke in support of the request.**

**Ms. Wanda Kemp, 444 Mountain Avenue, S. W., presented concerns with regard to the proposed Rescue Mission expansion. She advised that she resides in Old Southwest, she is Secretary-Treasurer of Gateway Guardians Crime Watch, and a care patrol member; and on a smaller scale than southeast, Old Southwest has been subjected to the undesirable behavior by some of the residents of the Rescue Mission due to their migration to the southwest area. She stated that she is not opposed to assisting the less fortunate, but she is opposed to their behavior and the inability of the Rescue Mission to control them; these individuals should be held accountable for their behavior, or the Rescue Mission should be deemed a nuisance property; and sex offenders presently reside at the Rescue Mission, and offenses committed by these individuals include aggravated sexual battery, rape and attempted rape, forcible sodomy, and taking indecent liberties with children. She inquired if the Rescue Mission has the right to jeopardize the safety of women and children by closely positioning them with known registered sex offenders. She explained that there are other service providers, such as Bethany Hall that is ready to assist women and children in need of the services they are equipped to provide, and expanding the Rescue Mission will only duplicate those services; Roanoke City should be concerned about the impact of expanding the Rescue Mission on residents of inner city neighborhoods and the dwindling tax base; and the expansion will encourage more Roanoke City residents to relocate to safer areas outside of the City of Roanoke. She noted that it should be said that Roanoke City is concerned for the welfare of its residents, first and foremost; without a healthy residential and business community, the long awaited Vision 2001 Comprehensive Plan will never be implemented; and southeast residents will not be able to stabilize their already crippled community, while absorbing an increase in the transient, homeless population if the expansion is allowed to take place. She asked that Council deny the request for rezoning.**

**Ms. Mary Allen, 1421 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, N. W., a Rescue Mission Officer, and Secretary of the Healthcare Board, advised that as a school teacher of 35 years, she knows first hand the importance of adequate preparation for school; and national studies show 79% of homeless children never attend preschool and enter the first grade 1,000 hours behind their peers in basic school preparation. She stated that the proposed new facility for women and children will include a readiness to read center with a focus on bringing these children into the school setting better prepared to begin the educational process. She asked that Council join her in supporting this important endeavor by approving the request for rezoning.**

**Mr. Donald Graybill, 2007 Shady Run Road, Vinton, Virginia, advised that he owns the corner lot on Dale Avenue and Fifth Street, which in its current zoning will allow construction of seven apartment units. He stated that upon his retirement, it was his intent to construct a seven unit apartment facility, to reside in one of the units and to rent the other six for retirement income. He called attention to the plight of senior citizens who live on fixed incomes of only \$300.00 - \$400.00 per month, and expressed concern that if the rezoning is approved, it will affect his ability to construct a seven unit apartment building on his property.**

**Ms. Marie Dull, 821 Tazewell Avenue, S. E., advised that she has lived in southeast for 43 years, and she is dissatisfied with conditions in her neighborhood as a result of transients who must leave the Rescue Mission at 7:00 a.m., in the morning and are free to roam the streets, begging for money to purchase food or alcohol. She stated that southeast Roanoke has suffered through very difficult times as a result of the Rescue Mission, and the Rescue Mission should not be located in a residential setting.**

**Mr. Ray Barbour, 687 Montrose Avenue, S. E., expressed concern with regard to the request for rezoning. He called attention to unsatisfactory conditions such as crime, litter, loitering, etc., that have devalued property in the southeast neighborhood. He commended Council for allowing citizens to be heard, and asked that Council review the request from a practical standpoint because the Rescue Mission is less than three blocks from downtown Roanoke and the Farmers Market and transients could panhandle and steal from City Market patrons.**

**Mr. Rick Williams, 3725 Sunrise Avenue, N. W., advised that the Rescue Mission performs a good service, but he believes that the Rescue Mission has, over the years, exploited the people of Belmont for its own purposes, because the Belmont area is a weak and relatively powerless neighborhood, in spite of the fact that this has been done in order to provide much needed help for needy people, the means that the Rescue Mission has used do not justify the ends; and the Rescue Mission's closest neighbors appear to be its greatest foes. He stated that the Rescue Mission has advised that this is the last phase of its expansion, although some Mission supporters do not believe that the Rescue Mission is being honest; however, there is a measure of healing which is possible in that the Rescue Mission can most likely do the work it wants to do without further abuse of the Belmont neighborhood; and a necessary first step is for the City to enforce provisions of the INPUD ordinance under which the Rescue Mission is seeking the rezoning. He explained that the intent of INPUD is to balance neighborhood and institutional needs so that institutions get flexibility and neighborhoods get developments that seamlessly fit in; however, the Rescue Mission's design does not fit in with the neighborhood. He stated that if Council allows the Rescue Mission to use INPUD rezoning to construct its facility, a condition should be attached to the rezoning requiring that the facility be redesigned to fit in with the residential character of the Belmont neighborhood which is required by the INPUD ordinance.**

**Mr. Martin Jeffrey, 3912 Hyde Park Drive, S. W., Roanoke County, advised that he was not present to criticize the Rescue Mission or the good work it does. He stated that the Rescue Mission and its Board of Directors are good people who are trying to do good work, but there is a scripture that says, "Don't let your good be spoken evil of"; and another scripture that says, "As much as possible, live in peace with every man". He stated that if the rezoning is approved, it will basically take 25 parcels of real estate off the City's tax roles at a time when the budget is in crisis. He advised that there is available space at the Rescue Mission that could be renovated for the proposed treatment facility that is far enough away from the other residential property of the Rescue Mission to accomplish the separation that the Mission desires and would not harm or further encroach upon the neighborhood and keep 25 parcels of land potentially on the City's tax roles.**

**Mr. Lee Osborne, 5152 Falcon Ridge Road, S. W., Roanoke County, advised that he stands in support of the Rescue Mission's expansion request.**

**Ms. Kathy Hill, 509 Arbor Avenue, S. E., advised that the City should follow the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that neighborhoods should be protected against programs that will place a strain on already overwhelmed neighborhoods by creating a facility that could lead to unsatisfactory living conditions. She spoke in support of locating the shelter in another area of Roanoke City or Roanoke County where it is not in close proximity to residential housing.**

**Ms. Linda Bannister, 3747 Long Meadow Avenue, N. W., appeared before Council in support of the request of the Rescue Mission. She advised that there is no facility in Virginia where a woman can go with her children for treatment; Bethany Hall, a facility in the Roanoke Valley, will accept women into its program who are pregnant and after treatment, they are moved to another home where they can have their child, but there is no program currently in the Roanoke Valley that will permit children to be with their mother during the treatment period. She stated that the Rescue Mission helped her during her time of need; and stressed that the proposed facility is not for transients, but for women who need help who have children; the children would become a ward of the state without the facility, and the facility will help women to become free of drugs. She asked that Council approve the request for rezoning.**

**Mr. Lewis Burk, 3747 Long Meadow Avenue, N. W., advised that he was a participant in the Rescue Mission Program which helped him to overcome certain obstacles in his life. He spoke in support of the Rescue Mission and the services that it provides, and asked that Council rezone the property which will enable the Rescue Mission to enhance its programs.**

**Ms. Fran Hodges, 315 Cassell Lane, S. W., appeared before Council in support of the Rescue Mission request.**

**Mr. Dan Doss, 523 Fifth Street, S. E., advised that within an eight month period, he called the Police Department 73 times to report public drunkenness, persons sleeping on his or his neighbor's back porch, and other unlawful actions due to the Rescue Mission facility. He asked that Council deny the request for rezoning.**

**Ms. Cheyanne Lark, 3501 Dona Drive, N. W., appeared before Council in support of the request of the Rescue Mission. She stated that the proposed site of the new facility will be on land that was not well maintained by the previous owner, therefore, the Rescue Mission should not be punished for past failures of previous property owners. She advised that she has seen dignity restored and hope renewed, both in people and in the southeast neighborhood, as a result of Rescue Mission programs. Speaking as a woman and a mother, she stated that it is her conviction that for many women who have fallen prey to drugs, their children may be their only hope for a life free of drugs and alcohol, because a mother will be less likely to seek help if she is forced to separate from her children; and a rehabilitation facility that provides a way for a mother to remain with her children may inspire dedication and determination to not only seek treatment, but to remain free of drugs and alcohol in the future.**

**Ms. Judy Rumford, 6334 Fairway Forest Drive, S. W., advised that she served as a volunteer fund raiser for the Rescue Mission and she helped to raise a majority of the capital funds necessary for expansion of the Rescue Mission from private sources. She stated that she has observed first hand the need for the women's facility. She called attention to the large number of persons who were in attendance to voice their support of the request, which is a strong indication of the level of support that exists throughout the Roanoke area. She urged that Council approve the request for rezoning.**

**Ms. Mary Boitnoit, 518 Fifth Street, S. E., advised that she is a 17 year resident of the southeast area and she is opposed to the rezoning of residential property and the alley closures for the benefit of the Rescue Mission.**

**Mr. David Harrison, 3710 Bosworth Drive, S. W., spoke in support of the request of the Rescue Mission.**

**Mr. David Burnleigh, 6622 Trevilian Road, N. E., spoke in support of the work of the Rescue Mission because 19 years ago, the Rescue Mission saved his life. He asked that the same privilege be afforded to women and children who are in need of the same type of help.**

**Mr. Bestpitch advised that he has personal knowledge with regard to the responsibility of recovery. He stated that 26 years ago, he served as a non-commissioned officer in charge of an outpatient drug and alcohol counseling center while serving with the United States Army stationed in Germany. He added that through his work in that capacity and subsequently working in an alcoholism residential treatment center in Richmond, he learned about the importance of recovery, therefore, he supports recovery for both personal and non-political reasons. He explained that he grew up with an alcoholic father who did not go into recovery and died at the age of 53; therefore, he knows first hand the importance of recovery. He advised that Council can impose enhanced penalties for people who create problems on the City Market, but the real question is what can be done to address the root causes of these problems. He pointed out that these people may be the sons of mothers who needed the kind of help offered by the Rescue Mission at some point in their life, but did not receive assistance. He stated that in some areas there are conflicts within the comprehensive plan, therefore, it is necessary to find the right balance; and the comprehensive plan speaks against clustering, but does not provide clear and specific definitions of what clustering is. As one member of Council, he requested that the record reflect that he will not support any further expansion of the Rescue Mission. He noted that the point of view of all sides of the issue has been beneficial and will contribute to a better decision; objectives, concerns, and issues that were raised by residents and others have helped the Rescue Mission come to what will, in fact, be a better design and a better facility; and concerns of the neighborhood have been greatly reduced by the process.**

**Ms. Wyatt advised that she does not doubt the extraordinarily good work of the Rescue Mission, but her concern is at whose expense. She stated that she has lived in the neighborhood on the corner of 5<sup>th</sup> Street and Dale Avenue and knows what the residents go through on a daily basis when they cannot allow their children to catch the school bus without adult supervision. She advised that the Rescue Mission did not intend for that to happen, but it is a reality. She explained that such a facility for women with their children will add three more classrooms at Fallon Park Elementary School that already has six outside trailers, which represents an added expense to the school system and to the taxpayers of the City of Roanoke. In addition, she noted that the Rescue Mission refers to the need to find housing for these women and their children when they leave the treatment facility; however, there is not one unit of subsidized housing anywhere outside of the City of Roanoke, which means that the majority of these women when they come out of treatment, without marketable skills, will need low entry jobs and subsidized housing, which equates to more money to be expended by the City. She stated that more police officers will be needed to address transient problems, which will be another pull on the coffers of the City, and more social services will be required which will also have to be funded by the City. She added that the types of commitments that the Rescue Mission is requesting from every taxpayer in the City of Roanoke will support the facility. She advised that she is not opposed to drug rehabilitation counseling;**

however, residents of the neighborhood are in a tremendous amount of pain and they are frustrated because they have tried to be heard, they believe that no one wants to listen to their concerns, and they are being ignored because many people who do not live in the southeast neighborhood like to feel good and they like to support what they think is a good cause. She stated that she feels the pain of southeast Roanoke residents, someone has to stand up for the downtrodden, and the downtrodden in this case is the Rescue Mission's neighbors. She stated that the neighborly thing to do would be to spread the good works of the Rescue Mission to a 15 acre farm that it owns in the Roanoke Valley, which would be a good place for children to enjoy fresh air, sunshine and freedom because they, too, will be recovering. She requested that the Rescue Mission seriously look at its needs for economy and expediency and whether or not those needs outweigh being a good neighbor and sharing the load.

Vice- Mayor Carder expressed concern over the statement that one is either for the neighborhood or for the Rescue Mission. He stated that the Rescue Mission proffered that the maximum number of beds for male transients will not exceed 101 which is the current number; therefore, the Rescue Mission does not plan to expand beds for male transients; and within the context of the rezoning request, he would not be inclined, as one member of Council, to support further expansion of the Rescue Mission beyond the request currently before the Council. He stated that the City of Roanoke is about to invest its Community Development Block Grant money into a comprehensive revitalization project in the southeast neighborhood between Jamison and Bullitt Avenues and the City's vision is that southeast will be a vibrant and beautiful community; the Jamison/Bullitt pilot project will be the most comprehensive neighborhood revitalization in the history of the City of Roanoke, and in order to be successful, all partners in the area will need to come together. With regard to crime, he stated that he looks to the City Manager and to the Police Chief to ensure a zero tolerance and if the City invests millions of dollars of CDBG funds into the southeast area, police protection is a key element. He called attention to the need for a healing process in order for neighborhood revitalization to move forward and to be successful.

Council Member Harris advised that he will support the request for rezoning based on the fact that the services to be provided for addicted women and their children are needed. He stated that Bethany Hall will not take women with existing children; therefore, it is a service that is not provided in the Roanoke Valley. He reiterated the comments of Vice-Mayor Carder that the concerns expressed by the Belmont neighborhood are an indictment that the City of Roanoke has not done its job in regard to public safety and other issues. He added that if a citizen has to call the Police Department 73 times over an eight month period, the City has failed in its efforts to serve that citizen, his street and his neighborhood; however, the Rescue Mission should not be held accountable. He requested a report on proposed strategies by the City Administration to improve existing conditions.

Mr. Hudson commended the good work of the Rescue Mission, although he stated that he understands the concerns of citizens of southeast Roanoke. He advised that the facility is well managed and he will support the request for rezoning.

The Mayor advised that there was a time when the Rescue Mission was able to contain its ministry within the walls of its facility, but it has been made clear that the ministry must expand to the neighborhood. He stated that those persons on the other side of the issue have clearly made their point that the City must do a better job of policing the neighborhood; however, he stated that he looks to the leadership of the Rescue Mission to provide more ministering to the need of the southeast neighborhood. He added that all citizens are expected to abide by the law and there should be no exceptions.

There being no further discussion, Ordinance No. 35821-041502 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith -----5.

NAYS: Council Member Wyatt-----1.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**STREETS AND ALLEYS:** Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, April 15, 2002, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of the Rescue Mission of Roanoke, Inc., to permanently vacate, discontinue and close four alleys in the vicinity of Dale Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Street, S. E., the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, March 29, 2002 and Friday, April 5, 2002 and in The Roanoke Tribune on Thursday, April 4, 2002.

A report of the City Planning Commission advising that the subject closures were requested to develop Rescue Mission property for a proposed new facility which is the subject of a pending rezoning request, was before Council.

The Planning Commission recommended approval of the request, subject to the following conditions:

**The applicant shall submit a subdivision plat to the Agent for the Planning Commission, receive all required approvals, and record the plat with the Clerk of the Circuit Court for the City of Roanoke. Said plat shall combine all properties which would otherwise dispose of the land within the right-of-way to be vacated in a manner consistent with law, and retain appropriate easements for the installation and maintenance of any and all existing utilities that may be located within the rights-of-way, including the right of ingress and egress.**

**The applicant shall dedicate new alley right-of-way as proposed in Exhibit B attached to the report and shall construct new access according to City standards.**

**Upon meeting all other conditions to the granting of the application, the applicant shall deliver a certified copy of this ordinance for recordation to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Roanoke, Virginia, indexing the same in the name of the City of Roanoke, Virginia, as Grantor, and in the name of the petitioner, and the names of any other parties in interest who may so request, as Grantees. The applicant shall pay such fees and charges as are required by the Clerk to effect such recordation.**

**Upon recording a certified copy of this ordinance with the Clerk of Circuit Court of the City of Roanoke, Virginia, the applicant shall file with the Engineer for the City of Roanoke, Virginia, the Clerk's receipt, demonstrating that such recordation has occurred.**

**If the above conditions have not been met within a period of one year from the date of adoption of this ordinance, said ordinance shall be null and void with no further action by City Council being necessary.**

**Mr. Carder offered the following ordinance:**

**(#35822-041502) AN ORDINANCE permanently vacating, discontinuing and closing certain public rights-of-way in the City of Roanoke, Virginia, as more particularly described hereinafter; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 65, page 544.)**

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35822-041502. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch.**

The Mayor inquired if there were persons in attendance who would like to speak to the matter. There being none, Ordinance No. 35822-041502 was adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, Harris, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----5.

**NAYS:** Council Member Wyatt-----1.

(Council Member White was absent.)

**HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS:** The Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard; it is also a time for informal dialogue between Council Members and citizens and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for any necessary and appropriate response, recommendation or report to Council.

**PARKS AND RECREATION-COMMITTEES:** Evelyn D. Bethel, Co-Chair, Washington Park Improvements and Memorial Committee, advised that in June, 2000, it was revealed to the community at large that in 1999, Walter Sullivan, Bishop of the Diocese of Richmond, had offered the sum of \$300,000.00 to the City of Roanoke to improve Washington Park so that St. Andrews Catholic School students could have specific times to use Washington Park, Lucy Addison Middle School, the Booker T. Washington Administration Building, and Victory Stadium.

She further advised that City departments held community meetings in which numerous segments of the community voiced displeasure with the proposed plans; therefore, the City Manager requested citizens to volunteer to work on the Washington Park Improvements and Washington Park Monument Committees, and it was later decided to combine the two committees into one and to initially work on park improvements.

She explained that the committee, along with personnel of the Department of Parks and Recreation, met for many hours to analyze and study ideas solicited by City staff and citizens about what was liked and needed in Washington Park; knowing that the park was partially built on a dump/landfill, the Committee repeatedly requested written information pertaining to the safety of the park, so that the validity of their work could not be questioned, but no report was provided; however, the Committee continued to work, despite the lack of engineering studies and timely acceptance/approval of its request for an architect with experience in the interpretation of black historical figures.

**Ms. Bethel advised that on February 26, 2001, the Committee presented a proposed Washington Park improvement “master plan” to the City Manager for review, acceptance and presentation to the community at large; while the work of the Committee was praised and plans were accepted by the City Manager, the Committee was informed that Bishop Sullivan would have to review the plans; apparently, Bishop Sullivan did not approve the Committee’s work because he withdrew his offer of \$300,000.00; and prior to completion of the improvements plan, no mention of a stream bank restoration project, or a First Tee Golf Program was made.**

**She stated that as the Committee began working on the second phase of its mission which was to develop a creative memorial for Booker T. Washington, it was informed about a stream bank restoration project being considered for the park; two presentations were made and during the last presentation, the Committee was told that the project would not accomplish its basic purpose of water control; therefore, the Committee rejected the stream bank restoration plan. She further stated that before the improvement plan was presented in January 2001, the Committee discussed and rejected putting golf in Washington Park; therefore, when City staff stated in October 2001 that they wished to make a presentation about a First Tee Golf program, the Committee rejected the idea; and it should be noted that golf was not one of the priorities listed by either youth or seniors, nor was stream bank restoration mentioned by the community at the various meetings.**

**Ms. Bethel explained that even though the Committee was told that an architect with experience in black history interpretation could not be hired, the City Manager later authorized \$3,000.00 which was the maximum amount for a non-bid project; the Committee was successful in contacting an architect with the qualifications desired and obtained a statement for services, with an estimate of costs that exceeded the \$3,000.00 authorized by the City Manager; therefore, Inner City Selective Development, a non-profit organization whose main goal is the improvement of Washington Park, volunteered to donate a \$10,000.00 grant/award for such services; and after numerous meetings with officers of Inner City Selective Development, representatives of the Washington Park Committee, and Parks and Recreation staff, an agreement could not be reached between the City and the architect.**

**She advised that recognizing that draft plans for a creative memorial throughout the park could not be finalized without an architect’s input and a stalemate had been reached, on February 1, 2002, the Committee informed the City Manager that its task had been completed and suggested that a community meeting be held to inform the community at large of its work; and on March 8, 2001, the City Manager, in part, stated that she would convene a community meeting after an engineering study had been completed. She stated that the Committee is baffled because it requested such studies in 2000 at the beginning of its work; no mention**

of such studies was made when the improvement plan was presented in February, 2001; with regard to finances for a well qualified architect with experience in interpreting black history, the Committee is puzzled because the City Attorney would not meet with the Committee, members of Inner City Selective Development and other City staff to resolve significant questions; and a community-wide public meeting should be held immediately to advise citizens about the true status of the work of the Committee, the status of Bishop Sullivan's offer and what the City has yet to do to implement the improvements master plan completed by the Committee.

Ms. Bethel advised that the improvement master plan was submitted by the Committee in February, 2001 and the offer of Bishop Sullivan was withdrawn shortly thereafter; the community at large has not been officially notified of the Committee's action; work on the creative memorial has been stopped in its tracks because of financial difficulties and to the extent of resources; therefore, it is requested that Council take immediate action to: (1) adequately inform the community regarding the status of Washington Park; (2) authorize sufficient funds to engage an architect with the necessary experience so that the full task of the Committee can be completed; and (3) assure that any engineering studies will be conducted immediately so that the work of the committee will not be in vain.

Ms. Brenda Hale, 3595 Parkwood Drive, S. W., requested that the matter be addressed immediately because it has been pending for over two years, promises were made, and funds were allocated for new and improved comfort stations that will be accessible by the physically disabled.

Robert Gravely, 617 Hanover Avenue, N. W., Member of the Washington Park Improvements Committee, advised that the Committee was told that a comfort station would be provided. He stated that parks are not included in the City's master plan, the City's parks have been neglected for many years and the cost to upgrade parks will be extremely high. He added that the City can use bond money for buildings, but money for affordable housing, pay increases for City workers, and park improvements is lacking.

Freddie Monk, 3343 Pittsfield Circle, N. W., Member of the Washington Park Improvements Committee, advised that the comfort station was to have been constructed last year. She expressed concern that at a recent meeting with the Acting Director of Parks and Recreation, it was stated that Breckinridge Park will be the first park to receive its comfort station and Washington Park will be next in line. She expressed anger and frustration that Washington Park has again been placed on the back burner.

It was the consensus of Council to refer the matter to the City Manager for review and report to Council within 30 days.

**Ms. Wyatt encouraged the City Manager to address the comfort station issue as soon as possible.**

**COMPLAINTS-CITY EMPLOYEES:** Mr. Robert Gravely, 619 Hanover Avenue, N. W., addressed the proposed pay raise for City employees. He stated that for the average City worker who continues to receive a three per cent pay increase, it will take approximately 30 years before that employee earns \$10.00 per hour. He noted that the City does not have a feasible pay scale, and the average black worker is neglected and rarely considered for promotions. He advised that while the pay scale for City workers is neglected, the City can finance bond issues for millions of dollars that benefit the business community.

**There being no further business, at 10:50 p.m., the Mayor declared the Council meeting in recess until Thursday, April 18, 2002, at 12:00 noon, for a meeting of the Roanoke Valley Leadership Summit at the Center for Applied Technology and Career Exploration, Technology Drive, Route 220 South (North Main Street), Rocky Mount, Virginia, to be hosted by the County of Franklin; and following the luncheon meeting, the City Council meeting will again be declared in recess until 4:30 p.m., on Thursday, April 18, 2002, in the City Council Chamber, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., for the purpose of conducting five interviews for appointments to the Roanoke City School Board.**

**The regular meeting of Roanoke City Council reconvened on Thursday, April 18, 2002, at 12:00 noon for a meeting of the Roanoke Valley Leadership Summit, which meeting was held at the Center for Applied Technology and Career Exploration, Technology Drive, Route 200 North (Business), North Main Street, Rocky Mount, Virginia. The meeting was hosted by Franklin County.**

**ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Ralph K. Smith and Council Member Linda F. Wyatt-----2.

**ABSENT:** Council Members William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., and William White, Sr.-----5.

**OTHERS PRESENT REPRESENTING THE CITY OF ROANOKE:** Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

**LOCALITIES PRESENT:** Representatives from Bedford County, Botetourt County, Franklin County, Roanoke County, City of Roanoke, City of Salem, Town of Vinton, Allegheny County and City of Covington.

**The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Wayne Angell, Chair, Franklin County Board of Supervisors.**

Following lunch, the business meeting convened at 1:00 p.m.

**CONSORTIUM FOR LOW FARE AIR CARRIER:**

**AIRPORT:** Ms. Burcham called attention to a recent meeting of Mayors and Chairs of member localities to the Roanoke Valley Leadership Summit in which Jacqueline L. Shuck, Executive Director, Roanoke Regional Airport, presented information on a potential grant to be made available at the Federal Government level to improve air service, which will be applied for on behalf of the service area supported by the Roanoke Regional Airport and as far west as three West Virginia communities. She advised that at a subsequent meeting of City Managers/County Administrators, the matter of forwarding letters of support of the grant application and offering seed money to support the project was discussed. She explained that Ms. Shuck will apply for a \$2 million grant, although it is recognized that the Federal grant will not fully fund efforts to improve air service; a dollar for dollar matching agreement is not required, but from the experience of other communities that have encouraged airlines to provide low cost jet service to a major destination, it is estimated to cost in the range of \$2 - 3 million for a multi-year commitment. She stated that the application is about to be finalized and any member localities to the Leadership Summit that have not forwarded their letters of support are requested to do so as soon as possible.

Mayor Smith expressed appreciation to Franklin County for hosting the Roanoke Valley Leadership Summit Luncheon.

He advised that at the first Leadership Summit, each participant identified challenges facing the region and improved air service was at the top of the list. He stated that the jurisdictions of the Roanoke Valley must work together to improve air service because economic development successes are impacted by many factors, with air service being a primary factor. He requested endorsement of a Roanoke Regional Airport Alliance, the purpose of which will be to recruit corporate support for the Roanoke Regional Airport, to coordinate/demonstrate the region's unanimous support within the airport service area, to provide a forum for exchange of information between the Alliance and the community at-large, to provide financial support to the airport for airport promotion, to support local travel agents and to assist in developing and implementing policy that will lead to improved general aviation service. He stated that Roanoke City and Roanoke County, with the concurrence of the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission, have retained the service of Barry Duvall to coordinate efforts of the Roanoke Regional Airport Alliance; Mr. Duvall is uniquely qualified to help the Roanoke Valley to increase its airport patronage, air service and support; and he will report monthly to the Steering Committee, assist with public relations, and appear before public boards and commissions, local governing bodies, State and Federal agencies, the Governor and Secretary of Transportation, and the State Board of Aviation.

**Summary of remarks from the floor:**

**Which airline(s) and what destination(s) will be addressed?**

**As a result of the Duvall study, will there be an opportunity to review other possibilities, such as moving the location of the airport?**

**Do letters of support from the political subdivisions bind the localities to the contribution of seed money? Ms. Burcham responded that at the meeting of Mayors and Chairs, it was noted that those localities providing seed money were requested to consider the sum of \$2,000.00; and even if a locality chooses not to contribute seed money, it is requested that they forward a letter of support of the grant. She called attention to representation by key businesses in the Roanoke Regional Airport Alliance, and commitments may be monetary, or business entities could commit to a certain amount of air travel time. She advised that the City of Roanoke has committed \$25,000.00, in addition to its \$2,000.00 in seed money; the grant application refers to a consortium of communities; therefore, an endorsement letter is requested from the 15 communities served by the Roanoke Regional Airport, and it is envisioned that the Regional Alliance will form an entity that will eventually become the source for dispensing funds paid to an airline, or for a special promotion. She advised that this arrangement has proven to be successful for the Cities of Richmond, Newport News and Norfolk by serving as a vehicle for funding of grants and other activities.**

**In conjunction with the grant application, Ms. Wyatt called attention to the need for transportation to and from the airport for those persons residing or working in outlying jurisdictions, such as Allegheny, Bedford and Franklin Counties, etc. Therefore, she inquired if funding sources could be identified to provide a shuttle service to and from outlying localities to the Roanoke Regional Airport.**

#### **REGIONAL WATER STUDY:**

**WATER RESOURCES: Wayne G. Strickland, Executive Director, Roanoke Valley Allegheny Regional Commission, advised that the localities of Allegheny County, Botetourt County, Roanoke County, Craig County, City of Covington, City of Roanoke, City of Salem, Town of Vinton and Town of Clifton Forge are participating in a regional water study to review future opportunities for water supply alternatives. He further advised that proposals are due on Friday, April 19; a technical committee composed of Utility Directors from the participating jurisdictions will review the proposals; and it is anticipated that a consultant will be engaged in the near future.**

## **BRANDING EFFORT IN THE ROANOKE VALLEY:**

**Ms. Burcham called attention to a trip that was sponsored by the Roanoke Valley Allegheny Regional Commission for members of the Roanoke Valley Coalition for Economic Development on April 29 - May 1, 2001, to Portland, Maine, which was attended by certain officials also represented on the Roanoke Valley Leadership organization. Following the visit to Portland, she advised that it was realized that the Roanoke Valley needs to project an image – who we are and what we are about. Also following the visit to Portland, she stated that four members of Roanoke City Council who participated in the trip expressed an interest in moving forward to define the image of the Roanoke region; therefore, at a meeting of City Managers/County Administrators she presented a proposal of the City of Roanoke to determine if other localities in the region would be interested in partnering with the City of Roanoke in this venture. She explained that a request for proposals was issued, and although a firm has not been selected, three firms are under consideration as finalists. She advised that the City of Roanoke was selected as one of 16 localities to be a pilot in Partners for Liveable Places (Creative City Project) and the City of Roanoke was offered the opportunity to host a regional branding shoret. She stated that 400 persons were invited and 65 persons attended the shoret on Tuesday, April 16, 2002, at the Jefferson Center; the forum was facilitated by Partners for Livable Communities and included a two-day visit by six community development/marketing professionals from across the country; participants in the forum included representatives from Roanoke County, Franklin County, Salem, Bedford, Vinton, and Virginia Tech, as well as numerous private companies and regional agencies; and Allegheny County has expressed strong interest in joining in the effort. She stated that it has been identified that the next steps are to define the region; a small team of marketing professionals from within the larger group is tasked with developing a market research survey to help identify key voices and themes in the region; each locality was asked to identify the amounts currently being spent on tourism and economic development marketing; and this research will then be used as a basis for the regional branding initiative.**

**A video was presented highlighting activities and accomplishments of Franklin County.**

**Mr. Strickland advised that the next meeting of the Mayors and Chairs of the Leadership Summit will be hosted by the City of Covington on May 10, 2002.**

**Mr. Strickland also advised that the next Roanoke Valley Coalition for Economic Development trip to be hosted by the Roanoke Valley Allegheny Regional Commission will be held on October 6 - 8, 2002, at which time the delegation will visit Charleston, South Carolina.**

**The Town of Vinton extended an invitation to host the next Leadership Summit Luncheon.**

**There being no further business, at 2:30 p.m., the Roanoke City Council meeting was declared in recess until 4:30 p.m., on Thursday, April 18, 2002, in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, at which time Council will engage in interviews of five persons who have applied for appointment to the Roanoke City School Board.**

**At 4:30 p.m., on Thursday, April 18, 2002, the City Council meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, to conduct five interviews for the position of Roanoke City School Board Trustee.**

**PRESENT: Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., C. Nelson Harris, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, Linda F. Wyatt, William White, Sr, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----7.**

**ABSENT: None-----0.**

**OFFICERS PRESENT: Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.**

**SCHOOL BOARD APPLICANTS PRESENT: Carl D. Cooper, Edward Garner, William H. Lindsey, William E. Skeen, and Robert J. Sparrow.**

**The invocation was delivered by Mayor Ralph K. Smith.**

**The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.**

**SCHOOLS: The Mayor advised that on June 30, 2002, the three year terms of office of Brian J. Wishneff and Charles W. Day as Trustees of the Roanoke City School Board will expire, and the purpose of the reconvened meeting was to interview five candidates for two vacancies on the Roanoke City School Board, for terms of office commencing July 1, 2002, and ending June 30, 2005.**

**He further advised that past actions of Council to comply with the School Board selection process include:**

**At regular meetings of the City Council held on January 22 and February 4, 2002, Council announced its intention to elect Trustees to the Roanoke City School Board for terms commencing July 1, 2002.**

Advertisements were placed in The Roanoke Times and in The Roanoke Tribune inviting applications for the two vacancies. Seven applications were received in the City Clerk's Office prior to the deadline on Friday, March 8, 2002.

At the regular meeting of City Council on Monday, March 18, 2002, at 2:00 p.m., Council reviewed and considered all applications.

At the regular meeting of City Council on Monday, April 1, 2002, at 2:00 p.m., Council voted to interview Carl D. Cooper, Edward Garner, William H. Lindsey, William E. Skeen, and Robert J. Sparrow for the two vacancies.

A notice was published in The Roanoke Times inviting attendance at a public hearing to be held by City Council on Monday, April 15, 2002, at 7:00 p.m., to receive the views of citizens regarding School Board applicants, and further inviting the public to submit proposed questions to the candidates by filing such written questions in the City Clerk's Office by 5:00 p.m., on Thursday, April 11, 2002. No questions were submitted.

The Mayor explained that the selection process provides that Council will publicly interview each candidate separately and out of the presence and hearing of the other candidates; and interviews will be conducted in the following order:

4:30 p.m.	-	William E. Skeen
4:45 p.m.	-	Carl D. Cooper
5:00 p.m.	-	William H. Lindsey
5:15 p.m.	-	Robert J. Sparrow
5:30 p.m.	-	Edward Garner

The Mayor pointed out that each candidate will be given the opportunity to make an opening statement of not more than five minutes, and thereafter, Council may ask such questions as Council, in its discretion, deems advisable. He stated that Council will hold five interviews and each interview will consist of approximately 30 minutes; after each interview has been completed, the candidate may leave the Council Chamber inasmuch as no action will be taken by the Council this evening; and all interviews will be taped by RVTV Channel 3 to be televised on April 22 at 11:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., and April 24 at 11:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m.

In conclusion, the Mayor advised that at the regular meeting of City Council on Monday, May 6, 2002, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, Council will hold an election to fill the two vacancies on the Roanoke City School Board for terms commencing July 1, 2002, and ending June 30, 2005.

**The first person to be interviewed was William E. Skeen.**

Mr. Skeen advised that the City of Roanoke enjoys one of the finest school systems in the country; under the leadership of City Council, Superintendent Harris and the School Board, Roanoke City is fortunate to have modern, up-to-date facilities, staffed with educators who are committed to their jobs; and over the last three years he has visited 20 schools and found safe, orderly, progressive facilities, with teachers actively engaging students with diverse school themes and special programs. He further advised that he found character in the schools, in administrators and teachers, and most of all in the students; he visited with Dr. Harris to learn more about Roanoke's schools, the duties and responsibilities of being a School Board member and Dr. Harris' vision for Roanoke's schools; and he came away from the meeting with an understanding of the importance of reaching full Standards of Learning accreditation for all schools, the serious ramifications if Roanoke does not achieve accreditation and he was impressed with the deliberate focus and direction of the City's educational system. He stated that he wanted to be a part of continuing to build on the tradition of excellence in education that Roanoke's school system enjoys today; and his experiences in business, non-profit, education and School Board-related activities will enable him to be a contributing member of the School Board. He related that as the parent of three teenage boys, one of whom continues to be educated at Patrick Henry High School, he understands the challenges and pressures that students face; as Business Director of a local community action agency, which has a major alternative education program, he knows first-hand the difficulties some children face in completing their education; as the husband of a special educator, he understands the challenges that administrators and educators face in working with limited resources; and as a 17 year adjunct faculty member at Virginia Western Community College, he understands the things that challenge, motivate and stimulate students toward higher achievement. He advised that with over 20 years of experience in banking, finance, and business administration, he has a good understanding of what the business community wants and needs in tomorrow's employees; and if appointed to the School Board, he would work to continue the tradition of excellence and to help implement and enhance numerous initiatives. He stated a desire to ensure that everyone is included in the communication and decision making process, including parents and teachers; an independently conducted annual survey should be conducted inviting teachers, staff and parents to comment anonymously on the progress of the school system, as well as existing and pending issues; and suggestions should be sought on how to make Roanoke's schools more progressive and productive. He noted that while there are many existing forums, such as School Board meetings, public hearings, and the Roanoke Central Council PTA, time is a factor for many parents and educators who may not be able to participate in these opportunities. Second, he added that an aggressive program is needed to educate and involve parents in their role as the primary motivator for their child's educational success; and it must be emphasized to parents that the School system is not the

primary and sole determinate of a child's academic success, because encouragement, modeling and motivation for learning begins at home, long before a child enters the school system, and continues during their formative years. He called attention to the importance of reaching out early in a child's first year of school and at the beginning of each school year by engaging teachers and principals to use personal telephone calls to educate, challenge and build a partnership with parents, because sometimes it is simply a matter of asking parents/guardians to be involved. Third, during this time of continued concern over school safety, he advised that a more developed and ongoing life skills program must be embraced, along with developing self esteem, teaching skills to manage anger and resolve conflict, and preparing students to emotionally handle the challenges, pressures and conflicts they will face during their school years and throughout their lifetime. He called attention to the need for increased investment in additional and ongoing teacher education and training, as well as technology upgrades, because the world is changing daily and teaching methods must adapt to a changing world; and teachers need an ongoing investment in their careers, along with the resources to teach children who live in and will work in a technology-based society. He stated that recruiting, hiring and retaining the best teachers and administrators is the most pressing need in the school system, as many experienced educators approach retirement or leave the school system for other opportunities; it is necessary to ensure that new teachers receive professional mentors, and the support they need to enable them to do their jobs effectively, that educators be compensated competitively and fairly for the time they devote to their profession, and that they receive the recognition they deserve. He called attention to the need to implement independent exit interviews, to collate findings, to identify issues, and to make changes when necessary and appropriate. If elected to the School Board, he pledged a willingness to listen carefully, study closely and work cooperatively to become a contributing member; and to be an advocate for meeting the education needs of all children, regardless of social or economic background. He requested Council's support, and advised that he welcomed the opportunity to give something back to the School system which prepared two of his sons for college and continues to prepare his third son for higher education, work and community responsibilities.

Mr. Hudson asked the following question:

Define what accountability means to you at the following levels: administration, teacher and student?

Mr. Skeen responded that accountability focuses primarily on students, teachers and the administration, but City Council and the community are also important components. He stated that students are the primary recipient and by grade five, six, seven or eight they must understand that they are the beneficiary, they are primarily responsible for their own education, and they need to be given the right and ability to fail or to succeed. Second, he advised that parents need to be

actively involved in their children's education by ensuring that they do their homework and acting as disciplinarians and role models. Third, he added that teachers, administrators and the School Board are responsible for providing safe, effective facilities and good educators; and City Council is accountable because the City has the taxing authority to raise revenue and the City Council appoints Members to the School Board. Finally, he advised that the community is responsible and accountable because the community is the ultimate beneficiary of the children who are educated for tomorrow's workforce.

Mr. Harris asked the following questions:

The Retired Teachers Association has expressed a concern for several years relative to a health insurance credit. As a School Board member, would you be willing to discuss the issues and give the matter consideration during School Board budget deliberations?

Mr. Skeen responded in the affirmative.

There are Standards of Learning and different philosophies relative to testing. What do you consider to be the instructional challenges facing the Roanoke City Public Schools, and what would you as a School Board member do to bring your philosophy of emphasis on instruction to the budgeting process and to other areas of the School Board's responsibilities?

Mr. Skeen advised that high standards and accountability are important for Roanoke's schools, facts and figures do not complete an education, and the Standards of Learning should not be used as the dominant factor in evaluating teachers, schools, or the School system. He stated that unfortunately, Federal and State governments have decided and mandated accountability, such that by 2004 students must pass the Standards of Learning to graduate, and by 2007, 70% of the student population must pass the Standards of Learning or the school system will run afoul of certain regulations and run the risk that the State will become involved in the local school system. He further stated that he would be hard pressed to say that proficiency in English, Math, Science and History are unimportant; however, the real solution lies with parents and teachers, in raising the level of expectation of involvement throughout the community, involving parents early in the school year, especially with at risk children by contacting the parent whenever a child's grade level falls below passing, and to work diligently to create improvement plans that enjoin everyone in the process, all of which are the key determinants to raising Standards of Learning scores and placing Roanoke City in the proper posture.

**Mr. Bestpitch asked the following question:**

**In order to operate a school system, there are three primary categories; i.e.: buildings and buses, materials and supplies and personnel. How would you prioritize the three categories?**

**Mr. Skeen advised that people are the program, with primary interaction by teachers and educators who are given the solemn trust of educating Roanoke's children and preparing the community for the future; and if one had to choose between more pencils, books, and computers, as opposed to retaining well-trained, educated, and committed teachers, he would choose in favor of personnel. He stated that it is very important to remember that the current difficult economic times will not last forever, and if the community wishes to make any type of change or to retain a major extracurricular activity, citizens should advise City Council and be willing to provide the money to fund a quality education.**

**Vice-Mayor Carder asked the following question:**

**Please place the following items in priority order: salaries, program enhancement, new schools/facilities, and student/faculty safety.**

**Mr. Skeen advised that student and faculty safety would be foremost followed by teacher salaries, program enhancement, and new facilities.**

**Ms. Wyatt asked the following question:**

**The new evaluation process for the City schools requires teachers to be involved in public service, and to demonstrate community involvement; however, there is a school policy that states if teachers serve on boards or commissions of non-profit or community organizations, or public office of the City, they must take leave without pay. Would you be willing to look at changing that policy to be more user friendly and to accommodate teachers in order to perform community service?**

**Mr. Skeen answered in the affirmative and advised that having spent most of his working career in the business field, he values the experience and expertise that citizens gain when they perform community service. However, he stated that persons must be available to operate the school system, therefore, the question becomes a weighting mechanism between what is considered to be time off with pay versus time off without pay; and he would be amenable to reviewing the matter.**

**Mr. White asked the following question:**

**What do you see as the major strengths and the major weaknesses facing the Roanoke City School system, and if appointed to the School Board, what would you do to amplify the strengths and to mitigate the weaknesses?**

**Mr. Skeen advised that the major strength is people--dedicated teachers, administrators, School Board members, and students; the historically close working relationship over the years between the School Board and City Council is definitely a strength; and diverse programming, with over 50 different programs, 33 magnet schools, approximately a 19 to one teacher to student ratio, a three to one computer to student ratio and five fully accredited elementary schools, with high schools provisionally accredited and meeting State standards all represent major strengths which demonstrate a commitment to education. He stated that the on-going facilities renovation program which started many years ago, not only improve the educational experience for students, but helps to stabilize neighborhoods; and advent of the two high school renovations create a certain level of excitement in the community. He further stated that the proactive work in making schools safe, with safety audits, and resource officers are strengths; and the diversity of students and educators provides students with a real world experience and something that will prepare them to interact over the long term. He noted that over 33% of all students participate in extracurricular activities which demonstrates that they understand not only the need to attend school, but a desire to attend. He referred to weaknesses as challenges, and noted that providing competitive, fair compensation to employees in tight budget times is a major challenge; there is a need to work diligently to improve the Standards of Learning scores, and working with parents to improve the lines of communication regarding the status of a child in his or her academic career; there is a need to work on the drop out rate, which is too high, with 300 to 500 students who drop out of school every year; there is a need to maintain a good pool of qualified people who are ready to assume responsibility and take administrative and principalship leadership roles, because in the past, personnel have retired and the school system struggled with teacher and administrator shortages. He called attention to the need for a proactive program to identify those educators and teachers in need of mentorship and development to empower them to assume their position when there are vacancies; site based counsels need to take a proactive role in the parental involvement initiative which is a major challenge, and the only way to improve Standards of Learning scores is through parental involvement. He further added that teaching life skills programs in the schools is important, most persons learn to manage anger and resolve conflict much later in their lives, therefore, an aggressive program needs to be put into place to teach students early in their academic career how to get what they want in the way it should be achieved. Finally, he called attention to the need to promote the school system, and to work with the Chamber of Commerce and the City's Economic Development Department to do a better job of educating people throughout the five-fifteen state east coast national area that Roanoke attracts quality teachers so that more persons will have a desire to relocate to the Roanoke Valley.**

**The Mayor asked the following questions:**

**Did I understand you to state that you did not think the Standards of Learning was a fair way to grade the teacher?**

**Mr. Skeen responded that he did not believe the Standards of Learning is the only way to grade teacher performance, but should be one component used in grading the teacher.**

**What is the proper way to grade and qualify the teacher?**

**Mr. Skeen stated the teacher must be qualified based upon how well the school performs, because the teacher has the student for only one year, if the student is in the fifth grade, four other teachers have supposedly done their job to prepare that student to complete and pass the Standards of Learning in year five; if the student reaches year five, and for whatever reason has passed through years one - four and in year five there is a problem, it should not be the sole responsibility of the teacher who got the student in year five. He added that if an entire school is doing very well on its Standards of Learning, and one class is not passing, that presents a different situation.**

**With regard to the per cent of City revenue, or the formula that is used for distribution of funds to the School Board, would you categorize the share allocated to the School system as low, high or about right?**

**Mr. Skeen ventured a guess that the allocation is probably about right, however, he qualified his answer to say that additional resources are needed.**

**The second person to be interviewed was Carl D. Cooper.**

**Mr. Cooper advised that the main reason he would like to serve on the School Board is because he has an autistic son and he worries about what life will be like for him, and because he needs to do everything in his power to ensure the best possible life for his child within his disability; and in fighting for his son, he will be fighting for other children. He explained that his son was a part of education systems in California and Pennsylvania; in California they said he had no problem, in Pennsylvania there was a small back room where they shut off children with disabilities, therefore, he and his wife reached the conclusion that they would return to Roanoke where their child could receive a good education. He advised that he wants to be an advocate for special education children, to fight the battle for those children at the policy level to ensure that they receive the services they need. He stated that he should be appointed to the School Board because he has worked with the City of Roanoke in various capacities, from the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee where he served as first Vice Chair and to his present position as Chair; he completed the citizen police academy and served on the Civilian Review Board, in which capacity he continues to serve; he serves as a**

member of the Neighborhood Development Review Team for his neighborhood, a member of the NAACP, President of the American Production and Inventory Control Society, and the Board of Directors of Girls Scouts. He added that he served on the Roanoke Vision 2001 Task Force, Chair of the Public Services Task Team, and Chair of the Multi-Services Center Round Table; therefore, if appointed to the School Board, Council would not be appointing a person who is unknown in the community. He expressed a desire to serve and to be of service which is a humbling experience. He advised that he has served to the best of his ability in all of his assignments; he would like the opportunity to serve on the School Board to ensure that his son receives the best possible education and to help other parents of children with disabilities. He expressed appreciation to Council for allowing him to reach this point in the School Board selection process.

Vice-Mayor Carder asked the following question:

Place the following in priority order: (1) higher teacher salaries, (2) program enhancement, (3) new facilities or new high schools, and (4) student and faculty safety.

Mr. Cooper responded (1) student and faculty safety, (2) program enhancement, (3) teacher salaries, and (4) new facilities.

Ms. Wyatt asked the following question:

One of the problems of the school system is finding substitute teachers when teachers are out of the classroom, and as a result, there are many times when classes are split among other teachers. How would you propose that the problem be solved?

Mr. Cooper advised the school system could draw on the resources of student teachers and students in their senior years in college who are planning to become teachers, by developing a pool of student teachers from local colleges, because student teachers or students in their senior year, engage in independent course study, have more time, are more settled into what they are doing, and have decided to choose teaching as a career. He added that there is a way to partner with higher education systems throughout the Roanoke Valley to draw on their resources, by offering incentives such as extra credit or a higher per diem. He stated that the most important thing is to get teachers in front of the students; and while some persons might be of the mindset that they are not full fledged teachers and not qualified, they are going through the training to be teachers, and they would not be in the classrooms alone, but in the presence of principals.

**Mr. White asked the following question:**

**What do you see as the major strengths and the major weaknesses facing the Roanoke City Schools; and if appointed to the School Board, what would you do to amplify the strengths and to mitigate the weaknesses?**

**Mr. Cooper advised the greatest weakness is the lack of parental involvement; and it has been determined that children who have high parental involvement in their education do better in school. He further advised that a strength is a community that is interested in its school system, with citizens who want to volunteer by working in the schools. He stated that to minimize the weakness, parents must be more involved through programs where parents can come to the schools at night or during off-hours and be a part of the process, with the ultimate goal of having parents become part of the team of student-parent-teacher. He stated that the strength in Roanoke is the caliber of citizens and their willingness to be involved in whatever needs to be done; there is a need to draw on citizen expertise through programs that allow parents and the community to be part of the educational process; there is a tendency to think that the teacher is the expert, the principal is the administrator and knows what is best, and the School Board is overseeing all aspects of the school system, but there should be a mechanism to ensure that citizens are allowed to be involved in the process, to bring their thoughts to the table and to encourage citizens by letting them know that while it may not be an overnight process, they have to persevere and negotiate until a conclusion is reached.**

**Mr. Hudson asked the following question:**

**Define what accountability means to you at the following levels: administration, teacher, and student.**

**Mr. Cooper stated that accountability at the administrative level is being responsible for the results of the school system; administrator accountability is results based, or what is being delivered for the money provided, and parents need to know what accountability means and where their children stand; and if things are not as they should be, accountability means saying to administrators that they have failed. He further stated if administrators succeed, accountability is in telling them that they did an excellent job, and as a result to provide a bonus or some other type of reward. He added that teacher accountability has to do with whether teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach in a way that students can understand and learn, because a teacher can impart all of his or her knowledge about a subject, but at the end of the school year, if the student still does not understand the subject, the teacher has failed; there are reasons why failure occurs, and it has to be determined whether or not the accountability is teacher-caused; and if failure is teacher-related, the teacher should be held accountable. He called attention to the need to be results-oriented, and demand at the end of the day to know how many students have learned what they are supposed to learn; teachers are the single most important element in a child's life in regard to education because it is the one-on-one bond between student and teacher, or the teacher who fires up the will and the excitement to learn that encourages and motivates a student. He stated that student**

**accountability means following the rules; student accountability has to be tempered because the school system is not only teaching learning skills, but growing people who will participate in society as good, productive citizens; students must be accountable within a system that tempers justice with mercy; students make mistakes that sometimes make no sense, and the question becomes what to do when these things occur, and if students are suspended or expelled, juvenile problems could increase; and accountability for students must include an incentive for accountability.**

**Mr. Harris asked the following question:**

**The School Board, through budgeting and policy, influences instruction. What do you believe are the greatest instructional challenges facing our City schools, and how would you seek to address those as a School Board member?**

**Mr. Cooper advised that the greatest challenges are the lack of money and resources to implement policy, and there are struggles over distributing funds among different priorities which are equally as good, but difficult choices have to be made. He stated that as a School Board Member, he would consider where the priorities should be; the greatest instructional challenges are not in the classroom, but outside the classroom; and the greatest challenge is the relationship between student-faculty-parents, because if that relationship is good, a lot more will be accomplished within the school system.**

**Mr. Bestpitch asked the following question:**

**What should the relationship be between the School Board and the Superintendent, and between the School Board and the City Council?**

**Mr. Cooper stated the School Board makes policy and the Superintendent executes that policy; City Council entrusts the operation of the School system to the School Board; and while City Council does not interface with day-to-day operations, it has an overall fiduciary responsibility as to how the schools are operating through a system of checks and balances. He advised that the relationship between the School Board and the Superintendent, and between the School Board and City Council must be built on mutual trust and respect.**

**The Mayor asked the following questions:**

**There has been discussion over qualifying teachers based on the Standards of Learning. What is the best method of gauging the qualities and results of a particular teacher?**

**Mr. Cooper stated that the best gauge is to determine the capability of the student and to determine how far the teacher has brought that student along in the learning process. He advised that teacher performance can be measured through the Standards of Learning, or any number of other tests, but should be results based.**

With regard to the per cent of City revenue passed along to the School Board, or the formula that is used, do you think the per cent the School Board receives is low, high, or about right?

Mr. Cooper advised that the percentage is low. He added that it should be recognized when talking about school funding that in past years, funding was based on property values, and in today's changing world, as long as schools are funded based on property values, there will continue to be problems.

The third person to be interviewed was William H. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey advised that he is a proponent of the Roanoke City Public School System; there are approximately 13,000 students with a great variety of needs; and with such a diverse student population, he has been impressed with both student and teaching quality. He commended the City/Schools on school construction/renovation which will present a challenge to all. As an attorney, he stated that he has had an opportunity to work with the School Superintendent's Office through the Juvenile Court system and he has been impressed with the level of talent and energy exhibited by staff. If appointed to the School Board, he added that his intention would be to continue with the strengths that have been demonstrated in the past, to encourage remaining on course with school construction and renovation projects, and continue to ensure a bright future for Roanoke's students.

Mr. Harris asked the following question:

What do you believe are the greatest instructional challenges facing the Roanoke City Public Schools, and what would you, as a School Board Member, do to address those challenges?

Mr. Lindsey advised that one of the most important challenges is to keep class sizes at a tolerable level; there must be teaching quality and Roanoke's process of attracting teachers helps the school system to attract good teachers. He stated that if class sizes can be kept at an appropriate level, if the level of teacher compensation is competitive with neighboring jurisdictions, other markets in Virginia, and the national level, those things alone should maintain the quality of the past. He called attention to the effectiveness of teaching assistants in the classroom, whether they be student teachers, interns or extras; he would not favor programs that impede a teacher's ability to teach, and would prefer to keep certain matters outside of the classroom, thereby allowing teachers to do their job.

Mr. Bestpitch asked the following question:

**What should be the relationship between the School Board and the Superintendent, and between the School Board and City Council?**

**Mr. Lindsey stated that City Council appoints the School Board and there is accountability to Council, individuals should be appointed who will bring energy and creativity to the job of setting policy for the school system and managing the budget; and the school budget is in the range of \$100 million so there is considerable accountability as far as voters, taxpayers and parents are concerned. With regard to the office of Superintendent, he stated that the School Board's responsibilities are to hire, review and if necessary fire the Superintendent; the Superintendent has a difficult job; and as a School Board Member, it would be his goal to become well acquainted with the Office of Superintendent which appears to be a complex office, with a talented staff. In summary, he advised that the Superintendent must be accountable to the School Board, the School Board must be accountable to City Council, and all parties must be accountable to parents and taxpayers.**

**Vice-Mayor Carder asked the following question:**

**Prioritize the following: (1) higher teacher salaries, (2) program enhancement, (3) new facilities and new high schools, and (4) student/faculty safety.**

**First, Mr. Lindsey stated that teacher salaries have some priority, followed by construction needs. He advised that based upon reports from students and parents, the school system is performing well in regard to school safety, which he would rank below program enhancement.**

**Ms. Wyatt asked the following question:**

**As a School Board member, would you be interested in before and after school programs as a joint effort between the City, the School Board, and community organizations?**

**Mr. Lindsey responded in the affirmative, and advised that in view of where some schools are ranking in performance on standardized tests, some type of assistance will be necessary; and it is essential in all schools that before and after school programs be provided. From what he has seen of current programs, he advised that there is not a lot to work with, but the system does a good job with current resources; more assistance is needed insofar as community involvement, volunteer involvement, and organizations taking more interest through mentorship programs. He noted that quite often in two parent families, both parents work, and some parents do not have control over their schedules; therefore, if attention is not given to the before and after school programs, there could be difficulty with the student receiving the help they need to focus on their studies, particularly those with special education. He advised that ideally every student will have 30 - 60 minutes**

of quiet time every evening with someone to help him or her with homework, but that does not always apply, therefore, if assistance can be provided through after school and before school programs, it will be beneficial to all schools and particularly to those schools that are struggling to improve performance and to help students to be more productive.

**Mr. White asked the following question:**

**What do you see as the major strengths and the major weaknesses facing the Roanoke City Schools, and if appointed to the School Board, what would you do to amplify the strengths and to mitigate the weaknesses?**

**Mr. Lindsey stated that the Roanoke City School System has a different job than some of the neighboring school systems, because the system works with a diverse group of students, with varying abilities and needs, which is a strength because it provides the City with an opportunity to place resources into what is now a fairly good size student population. He stated that the School system has done a particularly good job with students who are at the upper end, or those who have ability and are clearly college bound and hungry for challenge through good programs which motivate and keep them fed intellectually. With regard to weaknesses, he stated that there are students who are less able academically and need assistance through more remedial programs. He explained that mainstream students in most any system will perform well, but it is at the perimeters at either end where the challenges are encountered; from the court system perspective, the City must deal with special situations that other jurisdictions either do not have the ability or the desire to address which is both a strength and a weakness in that the City has the programs and historically the City has had a good functioning system. He called attention to a weakness insofar as losing personnel, even for legitimate reasons such as retirement; the school system has vacant positions that need to be filled and if good people fill those positions, good things will happen to the school system, therefore, the school system should track and retain good personnel. He stated that he would be interested in seeing some sort of feedback from teachers and administrators as to why they leave the school system through an exit interview. He further stated that the School Board should have a level of involvement by going into every school to become acquainted with personnel and to implement procedures in order to obtain the necessary information.**

**Mr. Hudson asked the following question:**

**Define what accountability means to you at the following levels: administration, teacher, and student.**

**Mr. Lindsey advised that it is necessary to define the types of students that are a product of Roanoke's school system; if the school system has a lot of successful students going to college and being successful in the community, this is defined as accountability; accountability at the School Board level means to do the work through creativity, managing the budget and being responsible to the public through City Council for expenditures. In terms of student accountability, he stated that he was reluctant to measure students in terms of test scores because of the different abilities represented and because good students will score well and those students who need help will not score as well; and a good relationship with just one teacher will help a less than talented student do well.**

**The Mayor asked the following questions:**

**There has been discussion over qualifying teachers based on the Standards of Learning. What is the best method of gauging the qualities and results of a particular teacher?**

**Mr. Lindsey advised that he is not aware of a good way to articulate how to gauge the performance of teachers; one cannot look at the test scores of a particular class and say that a teacher is doing a good job, and say in another class that the teacher is not performing well. He called attention to the importance of the opinion of principals, what do teachers think about other teachers, and a self-evaluation process; typically, in any given field, peers are a good judge of how others perform, and he would favor an evaluation process including the opinion of parents regarding a teacher's performance, what teachers think of each other, and how the principal views operation of the school and whether teachers are responsive to the goals set out in the academic program. In summary, he stated that all of the above would be a fair measure of teacher performance.**

**Do you think the per cent of the City's revenue that is passed on to the School Board is low, high, or about right?**

**Mr. Lindsey responded that the percentage is low based on construction needs for school improvements and capital projects.**

**The fourth person to be interviewed was Robert J. Sparrow.**

**Mr. Sparrow expressed appreciation for the opportunity to be interviewed for a position on the School Board and requested that he be entrusted with the support of Council to fill one of the two School Board vacancies. He advised that he is a native of Roanoke, he attended the Roanoke City Public Schools, two of his children currently attend Roanoke City Public Schools; and he has had numerous opportunities to leave the City of Roanoke, but has chosen to reside in Roanoke where he is employed by First Union National Bank as a Financial Specialist. He**

stated that he applied for appointment to the School Board because Roanoke is the best place in the nation to live, to raise a family, and to attend school; and his major reason for remaining in the City of Roanoke is its school system and the commitment by educators to Roanoke's students. He added that he was fortunate to be raised in a home where both parents were educators, his mother worked in the City schools and his father taught in the City schools for over 39 years, his siblings are employed in the educational system, and conversations with his siblings and their peers, his children and their friends, students, teachers and principals have provided invaluable information on some of the successes and areas of opportunity within the Roanoke City School system. He advised that one of the successes is the continued effort to make the Roanoke school system one of the safest in the nation. He spoke in support of developing a forum where instructional best practices could be shared in a team approach within all schools, in an effort to use the best practices to raise test preparedness and results for the Standards of Learning scores. He further advised that he would bring to the School Board his experiences as a father through perspectives he has received from his two school age children insofar as using this leverage to help other students within the Roanoke City School system, teachers and principals. He added that he would bring his personal experiences as a product of the City school system, he would bring the experience of a Substitute Teacher, he would bring experiences and education as an accountant and a systems analyst in a large corporation, he would bring entrepreneurial experiences from owning his own business, which has helped him to understand the need to make every dollar go toward the benefit that needs to be achieved, and he would bring the knowledge acquired from an intense training program at First Union Wachovia with regard to money management, annuities and mutual funds. He stated that the School Board is currently comprised of some of the brightest leaders in the Roanoke Valley; and his personal and professional experiences and his vested interests would allow him to quickly become a productive member of that team, to adapt quickly to fiduciary responsibilities as a School Board member, and to draw upon his experiences to make good, common sense decisions that will continue to give all children the opportunity to compete and to succeed in a global arena.

Mr. White asked the following question:

What do you see as the major strengths and the major weaknesses facing the Roanoke City schools, and if you are appointed to the School Board, what would you do to amplify the strengths and to mitigate the weaknesses?

Mr. Sparrow stated the major strengths within the school system are the opportunities offered to children, coupled with the opportunities for staff development among teachers, and the most beneficial strength is the commitment of teachers to students. He further stated that some areas of opportunity or weaknesses pertain to parental involvement; communication of the same information to all teachers in all schools from central administration to enable everyone to understand what is expected; and the lack of male African-American role models within some of the schools in certain neighborhoods.

**Mr. Hudson asked the following question:**

**Briefly define what accountability means to you at the following levels: administration, teacher, and student.**

**Mr. Sparrow advised that accountability for the school administration starts from the top; accountability would consist of those involved on City Council and those involved on the School Board, as well as the Superintendent; and this is a circle or pattern where each should hold the other accountable and have a clear understanding of all expectations with regard to teachers. He stated that the expectation is to deliver, based on available tools, the best opportunity to learn and to create an educational friendly environment for students so that they will be more receptive to learning. For students, he stated that their accountability is to attend school every day and to put forth their very best effort.**

**Mr. Bestpitch explained that Council Member Harris had to leave the meeting to attend another commitment; whereupon, he asked the following question on behalf of Mr. Harris:**

**The School Board, through budgeting and policy, influences instruction. What do you believe are the greatest instructional challenges facing the City schools, and how would you seek to address those challenges as a School Board member?**

**Mr. Sparrow stated that with proposed budget cuts, the greatest challenge will be to place more educational support staff in the classrooms, especially grades K - 3 where development begins. He advised that as a School Board member, he would hold himself and other School Board members accountable to ensure that funds are used where they will have the greatest impact on students.**

**Mr. Bestpitch asked the following question:**

**What do you think the relationship should be between the School Board and the Superintendent, and between the School Board and City Council?**

**Mr. Sparrow stated that it is the responsibility of the School Board to hire the School Superintendent, therefore, the School Board should make sure that it is well educated in its choice of a Superintendent; and the Superintendent should be held accountable for the goals and initiatives that have a direct impact on the children. He advised that City Council is entrusted with appointment of the School Board and it is important for Council to know each individual appointed to the School Board to ensure the selection of individuals who represent the citizens of Roanoke.**

**Vice-Mayor Carder asked the following question:**

**Prioritize the following: (1) higher teacher salaries, (2) program enhancement, (3) new high schools or new facilities, and (4) student/faculty safety.**

**Mr. Sparrow advised that first is student and faculty safety, second would be teacher salaries, third would be new high schools or facilities, and fourth would be program enhancement.**

**Ms. Wyatt asked the following question:**

**If elected to the School Board, what would be your position on before and after school programs that would involve not only the school system, but the City and certain community organizations?**

**Mr. Sparrow stated that before and after school programs offer a great opportunity, and if appointed to the School Board, he would be willing to work to ensure that children who are taking care of themselves are provided with the role models they need to help in their educational pursuits, and to provide role models to help develop their interests and standards so that students may compete globally.**

**The Mayor asked the following questions:**

**With regard to grading teacher performance, what method would you use to qualify whether a teacher is performing satisfactorily?**

**Mr. Sparrow advised that once expectations are clearly set forth by the School Board, the Superintendent and principals, teachers can be observed on a daily or weekly basis to determine and ensure that they are performing as expected.**

**There is a formula of revenues that come to the City which is shared with the School system. Would you say that the portion which is appropriated to the School Board is too low, too high, or about right?**

**Mr. Sparrow advised the portion allocated to the schools is too low.**

**The fifth and last person to be interviewed was Edward Garner.**

**Mr. Garner advised that he has been married for 33 years, he has one daughter, he has an undergraduate degree from Albany State College in Albany, Georgia, a masters degree in public administration from the University of Georgia, a law degree and is a member of the Georgia State Bar Association. He stated that he believes in public education because it is the foundation of the nation and the foundation of what Americans have achieved over the years; and he is qualified to serve via his education, training, and temperament. He added that as a Member of the School Board, his first priority would be student achievement; the purpose of a School Board is to ensure that the standards which have been set and certain basics of learning are achieved by the young people; students should be educated to the point where they can assume leadership roles in the future, with the education and ability to operate the City and continue to educate future generations. With regard to achievement, he called attention to the importance of school safety for all 13,160**

students in the City of Roanoke public schools, because school safety has a definite impact upon the ability of students to learn and to achieve. He added that another priority that has to be considered is the Standards of Learning because Roanoke City Schools must meet certain requirements, which are tied into the standards of accreditation and the standards of quality, that design and mandate a number of things that City Council and he, if appointed to the School Board, will have to do. He stated that the Standards of Learning set out an agenda that must be followed and he is confident that the City of Roanoke has in place the infrastructure that is necessary to achieve those objectives and to reach those standards. He explained that in the year 2001, eight schools had not achieved the Standards of Learning requirements, and this year the number was cut to four schools, with testing to resume shortly. He further stated that remedial programs have been put into place to help achieve goals and objectives that are mandated to be achieved; and the Flannagan Assessment Methodology and the Walstrom Data Analysis have been acquired to help Roanoke City teachers to achieve the goals and objectives of the Standards of Learning, as well as to meet the requirements set out in the Standards of Quality. He advised that another priority is personnel; Roanoke City schools employ 1,962 persons, the City school budget is in the range of \$106 million with approximately \$47 million coming from the City of Roanoke which demonstrates that City Council has a commitment and a stake in the public school system. He noted that \$47 million goes a long way to fund the salaries of the 1,962 personnel; along with the \$47 million from the City is another \$42 million from the State and another \$9 million from State income tax. He stated that he was gratified to see the changes in the budget, most of which will be slated for personnel costs, and raising teacher salaries from 2.75 per cent to 3 per cent, since personnel in the City schools should be just as well compensated or better than others in the region and state. He added that City Council has done a good job in bringing up the salary level to the national average, and an effort should be made to maintain that level. At the same time, he added that Roanoke must be competitive regionally, and keeping the 1,049 teachers compensated is a part of personnel development. Also, he noted that there are 29 administrators, 29 principals, and 21 assistant principals who need to be adequately compensated and trained in their quest to achieve the goals and objectives for the Standards of Learning. In addition, he added that there are classified and transportation personnel whose salaries and benefits are important and as a School Trustee he would work to ensure that these employees are adequately compensated, trained, and that their goals and expectations are met. He called attention to a professional development plan which was devised and implemented in order to upgrade the skills of teachers, administrators, principals and assistant principals to help them to be the best they can be, and to help students become the best they can be by achieving what has been mandated in the Standards of Learning. He advised that school personnel have achieved and in many instances surpassed the standards of quality mandated by the State and as a School Trustee he would work to ensure that the standards of quality mandates are fully funded. He stated that student achievement is of first importance, followed by personnel development, parental and citizen involvement, and maintaining a cordial, effective relationship with City Council and other School Board members and elected officials.

**Ms. Wyatt asked the following question:**

**What is your position regarding before and after school programs for our young people as a combined effort of the City of Roanoke, the School system, and community organizations?**

**Mr. Garner spoke in support of before and after school programs; however, funding must be considered; the school system must ensure that mandated requirements are met first; and if mandated requirements are met and there are excess funds to provide before and after school programs, he would support their implementation.**

**Mr. White asked the following question:**

**What do you see as the major strengths and the major weaknesses facing the Roanoke City Schools, and if appointed to the School Board, what would you do to amplify the strengths and to mitigate the weaknesses?**

**Mr. Garner stated that a major strength is in the commitment that citizens have exhibited to the school system, and citizens have done an admirable job in funding the school system, although perhaps not at the level desired; and there is a commitment from the business community, in conjunction with the Higher Education Center, with regard to workforce training. He advised that a weakness lies in the fact that approximately 56 per cent of students qualify for free or reduced lunches, which presents a challenge; there is a need for more parental involvement which goes a long way in making a difference and changing and influencing a child's attitude toward education because children are much more willing to learn if they have an attitude of learning and have been taught that learning has a benefit and a reward, not only from a pecuniary standpoint, but from the standpoint of making oneself a better person and a better citizen.**

**Mr. Hudson asked the following question:**

**Briefly define what accountability means to you at the following levels: administration, teacher and student.**

**Mr. Garner advised that accountability means to be held to a standard so that one knows what one is supposed to do and the task is performed accordingly, and to be knowledgeable about all aspects of responsibility. From the standpoint of an administrator, he stated the importance of being knowledgeable about the position and to execute responsibilities by initiating those programs that will achieve the necessary standards, whether they be Standards of Learning objectives or objectives of the School Board, or programs that citizens support. He stated that the teacher is accountable to the student by ensuring that the student is taught to the best of the teacher's ability and to the best of the student's ability; the teacher is also accountable to the administration, to the principal, to the School Board, and**

to the City of Roanoke. He advised that the student is accountable to the school first, to attend school and to be prepared and ready to learn, to help ensure that the school system works well and is safe; and the student has a responsibility to himself, his parents, his teachers, administrators and all persons in the chain of command to learn.

Mr. Bestpitch explained that Council Member Harris had to leave the Council meeting due to another commitment; therefore, on behalf of Mr. Harris he asked the following question:

The School Board, through budgeting and policy, influences instruction. What do you believe are the greatest instructional challenges facing our City schools and how would you seek to address those challenges as a School Board member?

Mr. Garner stated that the School Board does, in effect, influence policy through the budget process, and without policy or priorities as instituted via the budget, the level of education and the teaching curriculum would be directly influenced or affected by the budget proper. He further stated that the greatest challenge to instruction is the reception itself from students by instilling in young people a desire to learn and the knowledge that education is required if they are to take their place in a changing world. He advised that the infrastructure is in place, with good personnel in general, good programs, good feedback, but young people must be inspired to learn and receptive to learning. He noted that part of being a good teacher is the means to inspire and to motivate a young person, and the key to instruction is overcoming a challenge.

Mr. Bestpitch asked the following question:

What do you think the relationship should be between the School Board and the Superintendent and between the School Board and the City Council?

Mr. Garner stated that the relationship between the School Board and the Superintendent has to be one of respect and communication, which also applies to the relationship between the School Board and City Council. He added that if appointed to the School Board, he would serve at Council's pleasure which in itself engenders respect; he would be respectful and mindful of the desires and wishes of the Council, just as the Superintendent must be mindful and respectful of the desires and wishes of the School Board. He advised that he would work to make sure that the good relationship between the School Board and City Council continues; Council has made a commitment as the stakeholders; there is good communication between the School Board and the Superintendent; and the School Board has done its job by implementing programs, retaining staff, financing, and infrastructure to get the job done.

**Vice-Mayor Carder asked the following question:**

**Place the following in priority order: (1) higher teacher salaries, (2) program enhancement, (3) new school facilities, and (4) student/faculty safety.**

**Mr. Garner stated that student and faculty safety would be his number one priority, but along with that would be new facilities; program enhancement would be number two, number three would be higher teacher salaries; and number four would be new facilities; however, numbers three and four could be interchangeable.**

**The Mayor asked the following questions:**

**There has been a lot of discussion about how to qualify teachers and how to determine if a teacher is doing a good job. If you were called upon to make that determination, how would you qualify a teacher?**

**Mr. Garner advised that there would have to be some kind of objective standards or outcome measurements, and one of the best and most objective methods currently in use is the Standards of Learning, which is a basic; there should be feedback from teachers, students, and teachers' peers to determine if teachers are doing a good job; and the outcome, or the product produced, which are the students themselves, should be reviewed with the knowledge that all students are not college bound. In summary, he advised that working with teachers, getting feedback, and engaging in some kind of outcome measurement, is the best way to determine if teachers are doing a good job, and setting up an objective standard or measurement that teachers must achieve. If elected to the School Board, he advised that he would look at the results, taking the feedback from those results and factoring it in to set up professional development programs to ensure that the skills of teachers are improved and measure up to the task or requirements that are set forth for attainment, and he would work diligently to implement programs and to receive feedback to ensure that those objectives are met.**

**With regard to the formula for determining the School Board's share of the City's revenues, or the percentage formula that is currently in place, do you think the formula is too low, too high, or about right?**

**Mr. Garner stated that it is difficult to say, the City has done a good job in funding education, there are State and Federal mandates that have been unfunded, and he would like to work with liaison persons and the appropriate legislative bodies to generate additional funding. He further stated that the formula works out to be about 24 per cent of the total City budget, and that determination would have to come from the elected officials who are closest to the citizenry to determine if, in fact, the percentage is correct. In summary, he advised that 24 per cent of the City's overall budget is about right.**

**The Mayor announced that Council will elect two School Board Trustees at the City Council meeting on Monday, May 6, 2002, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.**

**There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.**

**A P P R O V E D**

**ATTEST:**

**Mary F. Parker  
City Clerk**

**Ralph K. Smith  
Mayor**

-----